My Writings on Ataturk

Dr. A. Afetin

BERSERKER
BOOKS

MY WRITINGS ON M. KEMAL ATATÜRK

Prof. Dr A. AFETİNAN

A GIFT
READERS.

CONTENTS

I – A Biography of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk 13
II- The Intellectual Life of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk 29
1) Short sentences I have noted down 44 48
2) My writings on M. Kemal Atatürk
3) Various topics in M. Kemal Atatürk's handwriting 64
III – The Secrets of Kemal Atatürk's Success 109
Conclusion 121
IV – M. Kemal Atatürk's handwritten notes 125

FOREWORD

Throughout history, the Turkish nation has established states in various geographical regions and produced works of civilisation. In 1920, for the first time in history, a government was formed in Ankara under the name 'Government of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey'. In 1923, the 'Republic of Turkey' was established as a new Turkish state, whose borders were officially recognised by all nations. Prior to this, in virtually every period of history, the official titles of the Turkish states and empires established were either named after the founder of that state or after a Turkish tribe specific to that region. The sole exception among these is the 'Gök Türk State' (552–745), to which an epithet was added.
However, in the case of the Ottoman Empire, it is noted that foreigners sometimes used the name 'Turk', albeit not officially.
In accordance with the principle of national sovereignty, the founder of the Republic of Turkey is M. Kemal Atatürk. The unified homeland of the Republic of Turkey possesses a rich history of civilisation, and today, those living here as Turkish citizens are the heirs to the civilisational achievements of every era.
In our homeland, liberated from occupation in 1922 as a result of the War of Independence, under the republican system,

great importance has been attached to the establishment of democratic institutions. With the implementation of the Turkish Revolution, the institutions that had held our nation back on the path to civilisation in recent centuries were abolished, and efforts were made to establish a new order in line with the principles of the positive and social sciences, one that would be compatible with the global civilised world.

Reform movements were observed during the 19th-century Ottoman period, but these did not lead to fundamental changes in social life. However, they may be regarded as a preparatory phase for the Turkish nation. Our republican era is characterised by revolutionary movements. Although this revolution came about through the personal initiative of the founder of the state, Atatürk, he himself referred to it as the 'Turkish Revolution'.

To determine the direction of this revolution, one must trace Atatürk's intellectual life, for he was influenced both by the intellectual developments of his era and his surroundings, and by the realities of our national character. In this respect, the reform movements envisaged in the Republic of Turkey during the period between the First and Second World Wars served as an example to other Eastern countries. For this reason, Atatürk's personality and his phase of intellectual preparation are of great importance.

These revolutionary themes, which emerged from our National Liberation Movement, along with Atatürk's speeches and addresses, and his stance in preparing public opinion, are worthy of careful examination. It is for this very reason that his great speeches, addresses and statements, as well as his proclamations and telegrams, have been compiled and published by the Institute of Turkish Revolutionary History. Taken as a whole, these constitute primary sources for the history of this period.

As far as I am aware, Atatürk would personally synthesise his official speeches after gathering the relevant information.

Essentially, his distinctive style in all his writings is always easily comprehensible. I even know that he wrote his final opening address to Parliament (1 November 1938) whilst confined to his sickbed.

Atatürk read a great many books and, whilst sharing what he had read with those around him, he enjoyed engaging in discussions on various topics. It was evident that Atatürk, who also drew upon the knowledge of those in his circle, achieved great success in clarifying and guiding ideas.

'It is essential for a child to have been brought up through the normal stages of schooling and education,' he used to say. 'Whatever their age or class, pupils should be regarded as the leaders of the future and treated as such.'

In this book, I have compiled M. Kemal Atatürk's biography along with the words I noted on various occasions. When I later showed some of these to him, he made corrections. Some are also in his own handwriting.

These words were, of course, spoken in the context of various conversations to explain certain events. I present all of these as documents of Atatürk's intellectual life.

This book first outlines Atatürk's upbringing as a child of the people—that is, his formal education—and his situation during his military career, emphasising the importance of his getting to know the country's various regions and its people during this period.

Secondly, historical documents concerning the foundations of Atatürk's intellectual life and his achievements have been explained.

Naturally, these were implemented as forward-thinking ideas within the political, intellectual and economic climate of Atatürk's time. However, in accordance with his own thinking, the Turkish nation, within the context of modern civilisation, must also adopt as its objective the principles that emphasise continuous progress.

Prof. Dr A. AFETİNAN

I. M. KEMAL ATATÜRK'S BIOGRAPHY

In the year 1881, on a flower-filled, verdant day in May, a son was born to Zübeyde Hanım in a three-storey pink house in the neighbourhood situated on the hillside overlooking the bay of Thessaloniki (1). Her husband, Ali Rıza Efendi, who was then a civil servant at the Customs Office, was overjoyed at this happy news. The relatives and neighbours of this Turkish family visited little Mustafa's mother's postnatal bed for days on end, wishing the infant

a happy and long life. Did the relatives and friends from Thessaloniki ever imagine at that time that, fifty-eight years later, the fair-haired child lying in that cradle would, as M. Kemal Atatürk, the first President of Turkey, pass away one autumn day (10 November 1938) at the Dolmabahçe Palace in Istanbul—the former residence of the Ottoman sultans—and that the entire Turkish nation, the nations of the world would weep with sorrow—did his relatives and friends in Thessaloniki ever even imagine this at the time? Undoubtedly not. For Mustafa had not been born as a prince belonging to the dynasty then ruling the Ottoman state. He was simply registered in the population register as a subject of the Ottoman Empire. The news of his birth did not spread beyond the immediate neighbourhood. However, as Mustafa Kemal grew up, his reputation gradually spread and advanced at a pace not granted to everyone. His intellect brought a new light to his professional life and social circles, leaving a brilliant mark through its dynamic influence. In his half-century of life, he went down in history as a victorious commander-in-chief who saved Turkey, a head of state who founded the Republic of Turkey, the leader of the Turkish Revolution, and, finally, a Turk recognised by the nations of the world as a 'great man'.

Even today, Turkey is generally referred to as 'Atatürk's Turkey'. In this respect, to know his life as recorded in the pages of history, beginning with his entry in the Thessaloniki register, is to examine half a century of Turkish history.

When little Mustafa reached school age, his father, Ali Rıza Efendi, decided to send his son to a new-style school. However, his mother wanted him to receive an old-style education. This clash between the two ideas—the old and the new—left its first deep mark on little Mustafa. His mother's wish was fulfilled merely by holding the school enrolment ceremony. The father, however, enrolled his son at the new-style school the very next day. Unfortunately, the young father, who had left the civil service to go into the timber trade, would not live to see his son's education. Mustafa was orphaned by his father whilst still at primary school. Nevertheless, he continued his education despite the family's financial difficulties. He passed the entrance examination and enrolled at the Thessaloniki Military Preparatory School (1893). There, his mathematics teacher, Mustafa Efendi, was so impressed by his pupil's ability and excellence that he gave him the name Kemal. In 1895, Mustafa Kemal left his hometown to enrol as a boarding student at the Manastır Military Preparatory School. There, he developed a passion for poetry and literature. During the holidays, he improved his French at the Frères School in Thessaloniki. In March 1899, we find Mustafa Kemal enrolled in the infantry class at the Istanbul Military Academy. Whilst studying his regular lessons, he also read free-thinking poetry and prose and engaged in debates and discussions with groups of friends outside the classroom. He was also very keen on public speaking.

In 1902, having transferred to the War Academy, M. Kemal was reflecting on the state of the nation's administration. Whilst studying his military subjects and consolidating his professional knowledge, he was also forming his views on political matters. M. Kemal had come to experience the autocratic regime more closely in Istanbul. The young officer cadets at the Military Academy were gathering around new ideas and did not even hesitate to publish a handwritten newspaper. These articles, addressed to hundreds of Military Academy cadets, were penned by M. Kemal himself, and he also managed this activity. Although the school administration became aware of this situation, M. Kemal himself admitted in his memoirs that no punitive measures were taken against them and that they were met with tolerance.

M. Kemal himself admitted in his memoirs that no punitive measures were taken against them and that the matter was met with tolerance. During his three years as a cadet, he attracted the admiration and attention of his instructors as an understanding, intelligent and hard-working student. However, he was in a state of inner turmoil; under the influence of emotions whose meaning and nature he could not fathom, he lived, studied and wrote—reading whatever he could get his hands on—filled with a sense of resentment, sorrow and an inner sense of rebellion. The impressions and observations he gained at the War Academy and at the seat of government were so powerful that they left a deep mark on him. Whilst attempting to solve the military problems set by his instructors, he displayed the demeanour of a commander directing the battles of the future.

On 11 January 1905, Mustafa Kemal graduated from the War Academy with the rank of captain. He continued his political activities by holding meetings with a few friends. However, following a tip-off from one of them, he was detained in Istanbul for several months. As soon as he was released from prison, he was sent to Damascus, the headquarters of the Fifth Army in Syria (5 February 1905). On this occasion, he witnessed first-hand the situation in Syria under Ottoman rule

and, taking advantage of various opportunities, travelled throughout the country. He did not view the civil and military administration favourably. In October 1906, together with a few like-minded friends, they founded a secret political society under the name ‘Vatan ve Hürriyet’ (Fatherland and Liberty). He personally endeavoured to establish branches of this society in certain centres in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine, and intended to launch its activities primarily in Macedonia. Although he managed to set up a branch of this society in Thessaloniki with the help of some friends, the need to return to his military duties forced him to go back to Syria. In 1907, we find M. Kemal serving as a captain in the Third Army Headquarters in Macedonia. Upon realising that the branch of the political and secret society he had previously founded was operating within the ‘Committee of Union and Progress’ in Thessaloniki, he too joined this movement.

The proclamation of freedom on 23 July 1908 marked the beginning of the Second Constitutional Era in the Ottoman Empire. From then on, M. Kemal did not wish the army to become involved in politics. Accordingly, although he strove to establish the principle that the reform of the army and the training and discipline of officers were of paramount importance, the members of the Committee of Union and Progress, who had seized power and assumed office as a political party, did not accept this idea.

As a practical application of this idea, M. Kemal authored and translated a number of works on military matters during these years and had them published (2).

Following the proclamation of the Constitutional Monarchy, M. Kemal was commissioned to investigate the situation of those seeking to oppose freedom in Tripoli, then part of the Ottoman Empire; on his return, he also called at Benghazi and Crete.

It was he who served on the general staff of the ‘Movement Army’, which intervened from Thessaloniki against the reactionary movement known as the ‘31 March Incident’ (13 April 1909), and who drafted the proclamation addressed to the people of Istanbul. During these years, he was determined to reform the Ottoman military organisation, which he had criticised, and to prepare it thoroughly for future warfare. However, neither his rank nor his post was suitable for the task. Whilst serving as a regimental commander in Thessaloniki, he took part in the revolutionary movement that broke out in Albania in his capacity as Chief of Staff to the Minister of War, Mahmut Şevket Pasha. On 13 January 1910, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the 11th Thessaloniki Reserve Division.

In 1910, he travelled to France to represent the Turkish army at the ‘Picardie’ military manoeuvres. In September 1911, M. Kemal was offered a post at the General Staff Headquarters in Istanbul. However, at that time, the Italians were attacking Tripoli. He immediately rushed to the defence of the region via Egypt. There, he was promoted to the rank of major and, in 1912, commanded the resistance operations at the Tobruk and Derne headquarters.

Upon hearing of the outbreak of the Balkan War in October 1912, he returned to Istanbul via Europe, travelling through Romania. He assumed command as Chief of Staff of the Bolayır Corps, formed to defend the Gallipoli Peninsula, and subsequently took part in the recapture of Edirne.

A year later, he served as military attaché in Sofia, Bucharest, Belgrade and Cetinje. (27 October 1913 – 2 February 1915) Upon expressing his wish to serve actively in the Ottoman Army during the First World War, he was appointed Commander of the 19th Division on the Gallipoli Peninsula. On 18 March 1915, the Allied Forces, having failed to cross the Dardanelles, sought to land troops on the western side of the Gallipoli Peninsula (25 April 1915). It was here, at the Anafartalar sector of Arıburnu, that M. Kemal, by skilfully commanding the forces under his command, prevented the enemy’s advance and the opening of the land route to Istanbul, and established a line of resistance there. During these battles, he made great use of his leadership qualities, which complemented his personal bravery. During this battle, a shell fragment struck the watch in his pocket, shattering it and thus saving him from injury.

Promoted to the rank of colonel on 1 June 1915, M. Kemal began to gain recognition throughout the country as a commander who had achieved great successes during the land-based landing operations of the Battle of Gallipoli. Although he wished to launch an attack, anticipating that the enemy would retreat, his superiors did not consent to this. Consequently, he left the area on 10 December 1915; on 19 December 1915, the enemy forces abandoned the area as they had failed in their landing operation.

M. Kemal, who was appointed Commander of the XVI Corps in Edirne from Gallipoli, took up this post on 14 January 1916.
As this corps was transferred to Diyarbakır to be deployed to the Caucasus Front, he took up his post in Silvan on 14 April 1916, having been promoted to the rank of general.
Thus, in 1916, General Mustafa Kemal, as corps commander on the Eastern Front, fought defensive battles and, at the same time, recaptured Bitlis and Muş from the enemy (6–7 August 1916). Around this time, the Ottoman High Command, in conjunction with its German allies, drew up military plans for Syria and Palestine, and General M. Kemal was appointed Commander of the 7th Army within the Yıldırım Armies (5 July 1917). However, based on his investigations and observations there, he submitted a report to the government (2 September 1917) stating that these plans were unlikely to succeed, highlighting the country's general weakness, the fact that the civil administration had become unreliable, and that economic life had been paralysed, whilst offering recommendations to address these issues. Among the ideas he set out point by point, the following sentence at the end of the first point is particularly noteworthy: 'Consequently, whilst the war continues, the greatest danger we face is the possibility that the vast edifice of the sultanate, which is crumbling from all sides, may one day collapse suddenly and entirely from within.'
In Article 4, he reaches the following conclusion:
"The conclusion drawn from this brief overview is not based on the premise that all is lost and no remedy remains. I see no need to explain that such a belief is the most dire of all enemies and dangers. The possibility of salvation and survival exists; we merely need to find the appropriate measures," he says, and continues by setting out his views on the decisions to be taken:
"Our military policy must be one of defence and one of preserving the forces at our disposal—and every single soldier—until the very last moment. This policy cannot tolerate a single Ottoman soldier remaining outside the country." The report is lengthy and sets out all the measures to be taken.
The Supreme Command did not concur with these views. However, within a short time, the enemy's offensive with superior forces resulted in the occupation of Palestine, and Jerusalem fell into British hands.
The following entry appears in M. Kemal's military biography. On 9 October 1917, he was transferred from the 7th Army in Syria to the 2nd Army. On 11 October 1917, he arrived in Istanbul on leave and for medical treatment, and by 7 November 1917, he was under the command of the General Staff. At this time, he was commissioned to travel to Germany on an official visit lasting twenty days. Thus, in the final month of 1917, he accompanied the Ottoman Crown Prince M. Vahdeddin on a visit to the German Emperor (15 December 1917 – 5 January 1918). Having had the opportunity to closely examine the general situation there, General Mustafa Kemal did not hesitate to state clearly that defeat was the inevitable outcome for the Allied powers. Upon his return from Germany, he fell ill and travelled to Karlspad, near Vienna, for treatment. During his time there (July 1918), Mustafa Kemal found the opportunity to reflect more calmly on the state of the country and to seek solutions, whilst also reading a great many books. By this time, his warnings to the government regarding the Syrian front had come to pass to the detriment of the Ottoman Army. Vahdeddin, who had ascended to the throne as Sultan of the Ottoman Empire in July 1918, appointed M. Kemal to command the 7th Army in Palestine. However, it had by then become impossible to halt the enemy's advance.
Indeed, although the Ottoman army put up resistance in places, it was forced to retreat as far as Aleppo. Meanwhile, the Bulgarians had signed the Armistice of Thessaloniki (September 1918).
When the Ottoman Empire signed the Armistice of Mudros on 30 October 1918, the German commander was required to withdraw from the Syrian front, leaving M. Kemal with no choice but to assume command of the Yıldırım Armies. Faced with this situation and with regard to the implementation of the Armistice of Mudros, he sent telegrams warning the Istanbul government and informed the Grand Vizier of the danger threatening the country, recommending measures to be taken. However, the Istanbul government was far from being in control of the situation and was powerless. In November 1918, M. Kemal was relieved of his command and summoned to Istanbul. The pain of the general defeat at the seat of government led to some very trying times. Until May 1919, whilst engaged in political activities in Istanbul, M. Kemal was occupied with gathering supporters for his ideas and preparing his plans to free the country from this state of occupation

. General M. Kemal's final official post within the Ottoman state was that of Army Inspector, which conferred upon him the authority to issue orders to civil administrators and officials in his region.

In the month (May) in which he turned thirty-nine, General M. Kemal embarked on the mission to liberate Turkey and establish a new state. On 19 May 1919, the day he landed in Samsun, he set to work immediately. Whilst enemy armed forces were attempting to land and establish a foothold on the Aegean coast of the Turkish homeland, a sentence from the report sent from Samsun to the Istanbul government on 22 May 1919, signed by Mustafa Kemal, reads as follows:

"The nation has united as one (yekvücut) and has set its sights on the principle of sovereignty and the Turkish spirit."

In the face of the activities of societies seeking to organise in order to find regional solutions for liberation following the 1918 armistice, or those wishing to separate entirely from the Ottoman state and come under the protection of other states, M. Kemal articulated the fundamental principle of the War of Independence with the above sentence, stating: unity, national sovereignty and the Turkish spirit.

The central idea of the circular he sent from Havza on 28 May 1919 to the commanders and civil administrators in Anatolia is set out in the following sentence:

"The preservation of national unity; the establishment of national organisations for this purpose; the organisation of rallies to protest against enemy occupation; and the communication of these actions to the public, the Istanbul government and foreign states by telegram."

Here too, the idea of national unity is present, along with the recommendation to establish a national organisation so that the Anatolian people could protest against the enemy occupation.

On 22 June 1919, telegrams sent from Amasya issued an alarm to all commanders and governors with the statement: "The integrity of the homeland and the independence of the nation are in danger." Who is the signatory who invited the country's representatives to the political congresses of Erzurum and Sivas? The nation asks: what is his official title—Army Inspector and the Sultan's Honorary Aide-de-Camp? Does this commander have any past achievements? His military career, as explained above, is beginning to spread across Turkey in waves. His portrait, bearing virtually all the decorations of the Ottoman Empire, is being passed from hand to hand. It is becoming known throughout the nation that he is a victorious, distinguished and successful commander in the army of a state that emerged defeated from the First World War.

At this time, the general situation in the country is as follows:

The Armistice of Mudros is being implemented to the fullest extent in favour of the victors. The Treaty of Sèvres will merely ratify this partition (10 August 1920).

Faced with this, the Ottoman dynasty and government are in a state of complete surrender. They are in power, as it were, merely to fulfil the wishes of the victorious powers. The minorities are working towards the aims of foreign powers and establishing organisations. The Turkish people, the true owners of the country, are, however, leaderless, unorganised and filled with anxiety. However, the entire nation is dissatisfied with the general situation. Those contemplating the idea of liberation and independence are seeking only regional solutions. Should these organisations succeed, Turkey would be divided into small states, much as during the collapse of the Seljuk Empire. Yet, it is, of course, unlikely that these would survive for long.

Armed resistance has begun in places in the western and southern regions. However, in the face of superior enemy forces, retreats—and in some places, panicked flights—are flowing towards Central Anatolia.

Central Anatolia has naturally become the focal point of the situation. Now, a leader is needed to organise and unite these movements, which are being carried out with the best of intentions. If such a leader does not emerge, the independence of the state and the future of the country will be in danger. These militia forces, gathering here and there, will also be doomed to disband. It is around the name of Mustafa Kemal that this unity has begun to coalesce. The first alarm was sounded on 22 June 1919 with the Amasya Circular. In this document, bearing M. Kemal's signature, it is stated: 'The nation's independence will be saved once again by the nation's resolve and determination.'

In July 1919, at the Erzurum Congress, Mustafa Kemal resigned from his military posts and rebelled against the Istanbul government. In September, he emerged as the president of the Sivas Congress and as the unifying figure and revolutionary leader of the political societies in the eastern and western provinces. In the final month of 1919 (27 December)

M. Kemal arrived in Ankara in his capacity as chairman of the 'Representative Committee' elected by the Sivas Congress.

In 1920, we see that the movement which had begun in the country was officially organised around a single leader. On 16 March 1920, when the 'Meclis-i Mebusan' was dissolved by the occupying forces, he convened parliament in Ankara in his capacity as chairman of the 'Heyeti Temsiliye'. Let us now take a brief look at Turkey during the period between 1920 and 1923:

At the outset, material resources were virtually non-existent. However, by September 1922, the situation had reached a point where enemy armies could be driven into the sea. These forces may not always have been superior in terms of numbers or equipment. Nevertheless, the country's forces, having been organised into a regular structure and well-managed by the Commander-in-Chief and his capable commanders, succeeded in liberating this homeland. The Grand National Assembly of Turkey and the administration of the country were also taken into the hands of its government. The head of these was the same Commander-in-Chief. The war years were the most critical times. Domestically, the forces of the nation were initially divided into two factions. For this reason, it was first necessary to ensure unity. Meanwhile, whilst the enemy was advancing into the heart of the country with superior forces, they were driven out of the country through the First and Second Battles of İnönü, the Battle of Sakarya and, finally, the Great Offensive (September 1922).

Following the Battles of Kütahya and Eskişehir (25 July 1921), the Grand National Assembly, exercising the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, entrusted M. Kemal with full responsibility for the army, which had withdrawn to the east of the Sakarya, for a period of three months (4 August 1921) The Grand National Assembly of Turkey conferred the rank of Marshal and the title of Gazi upon the Commander-in-Chief, who had successfully led the Battle of Sakarya and forced the enemy to retreat (19 September 1921).

The Commander-in-Chief and Speaker of the Assembly, Gazi M. Kemal, stated in the Grand National Assembly (October 1922): "Our nation has achieved this success thanks to the unshakeable unity and determination it has displayed as one man."

On the other hand, as seen above, in the face of the Ottoman government's weakness, M. Kemal regarded convening the Grand National Assembly as the fundamental step towards establishing a government.

Of all the states deemed defeated at the end of the First World War, the Turkish nation was the only one that refused to sign the armistice and peace treaties and to accept their entry into force.

I say 'the Turkish nation' because the Ottoman state, by signing both the Armistice of Mudros (1918) and the Treaty of Sèvres (1920), unfortunately brought about the end of the Ottoman Empire. During the period between 1919 and 1922, the Ottoman State had been reduced to the status of a government without a homeland or a nation. Members of the Teali-i İslâm Society, who acted as aides to the Caliph during the War of Independence, declared in their manifesto that 'the Greek army should be regarded as the army of the Caliphate'. However, the truly significant aspect is that our national consciousness refused to accept the extremely onerous terms of these treaties with the Allied Powers, which the Ottoman government attempted to implement, and that these documents served as a powerful catalyst for the struggle for liberation.

When the Turkish nation, under the leadership of Gazi M. Kemal, liberated the Turkish homeland from enemy occupation after four years of struggle, the Ottoman sultan, who bore the title of Caliph, sought his own personal safety by taking refuge with the enemy commander. The letter dated 16 September 1922, written by the Ottoman Sultan—who had done nothing of positive value for the homeland or the nation, had failed to recognise the Turkish nation, and, on the contrary, had spared no effort in taking every possible measure to suppress the national resistance in Anatolia—under the title of 'Caliph of the Muslims', should be read as a lesson:

"To His Excellency General Harrington, Commander-in-Chief of the Occupation Forces in Constantinople: As I perceive my life to be in danger in Istanbul, I request asylum with the British state, in recognition of its prestige and influence, and ask to be transferred from Istanbul to a suitable location as soon as possible, sir."

When the Caliphate was abolished by the Grand National Assembly on 3 March 1924, none of the other Muslim states recognised the Caliph, who had gone into exile, or the office of the Caliphate, nor did they install him as the head of their states.

With the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on 24 July 1923 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Chief Plenipotentiary, General İsmet İnönü, the Government of the Grand National Assembly was recognised by all the states of the world as a state with defined borders and with the capitulations abolished. This treaty was a consequence of our military victory.

On 29 October 1923, the Republic was proclaimed, and Gazi M. Kemal was elected as the first President by the Grand National

. From that point onwards, the Ottoman Sultanate ceased to exist, and the foundations of a state based on republican principles were laid. For fifteen years, from 1923 to 1938, Atatürk served as the head of the state he had founded. In 1934, the Grand National Assembly granted him the surname ‘Atatürk’ by law. From that date onwards, Marshal Gazi Mustafa Kemal was known as ‘Atatürk’.

II. M. KEMAL ATATÜRK’S INTELLECTUAL LIFE

Atatürk, who stated that ‘It is teachers alone who save nations’, attached great importance to matters of teaching and education.

When he said, “In life, the truest guide is science,” M. Kemal expressed, through the word ‘guide’ (one who shows the right path), that science could provide guidance and illuminate life. Why, then, did he feel the need to go beyond this and add the adjective ‘truest’? When one reads this sentence and reflects upon it, one cannot help but pause to consider the words ‘the truest’.

M. Kemal used to say that when he studied the positive sciences of his own era as part of his professional specialisation, he was able to develop a clear and objective perspective, and that he aimed to approach any profession with mathematical precision.

M. Kemal’s upbringing, his educational life and the influences of his social circle greatly encouraged him to read. Throughout every stage of his life, books were his most precious possession.

Whenever he said, ‘Science and technology shall be our guide in the political and social life of our nation, as well as in the intellectual education of our people,’ he always emphasised the same principles.

The fact that his speeches and words always sparked an intellectual movement is because he made use of the publications of his time and always enjoyed the discussions within an intellectual circle.

Examining the annotations Atatürk made in the books he read yields some very interesting results. The examples I shall provide in this section of my book relate to Atatürk’s studies on specific subjects. I also wish to use this opportunity to identify the topics discussed in Atatürk’s circle and his thoughts on various issues.

There is frequent mention of the gatherings held in Atatürk’s company. Those present have written their memoirs according to their own perspectives. Our historians and writers, however, wish to write about these gatherings based on the conclusions they have drawn from what they have heard or read.

From what I have witnessed, the gatherings around Atatürk were very varied. During the day, he would usually be in his private library, either working with a few people or discussing a specific topic. These discussions would continue during car or motorbike outings, and he would often speak directly about specific issues with guests or members of the public who had gathered at his country houses in Ankara, asking for their views.

This practice was carried out even more intensively during his travels within the country; on trains, ferries and wherever he went, he enjoyed facilitating discussions by explaining the findings of investigations into new topics and national issues.

Atatürk’s daily intellectual life always found a field of application amongst every nation, and there was never a shortage of those put to the test before him.

To give an example, I must recount the following incident. One day, when a dentist came to treat his teeth, he began asking questions from the sociology book I was reading at the time. Naturally, the dentist, who was not in a position to answer immediately, felt embarrassed. I intervened, brought the book over straight away and pointed out that it was a very recent publication. Atatürk, on the other hand, turned the matter into a joke and said to the dentist: ‘I know you excel in your own profession, but I wanted to encourage you to read by taking an interest in other matters as well, which is why I specifically chose such an unconventional subject.’ On his next visit, the dentist

, having read them, and on this occasion, he asked Atatürk some questions about them. There are many more examples like this that could be given.

For instance, during Atatürk's regular motorboat trips on the Bosphorus, a book or a particular topic would invariably become the subject of conversation, and by the end of the trip, everyone would have learnt something.

Added to these were Atatürk's evening gatherings. Those invited varied depending on the circumstances. When he was in Ankara, the custom was as follows: every day, the Secretary-General would brief Atatürk on the documents that had arrived and receive his instructions. Depending on the situation, he would issue directives on domestic affairs and international events, or sometimes he would investigate matters in depth and gather information. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister and some ministers would come to discuss government affairs whenever they deemed it necessary.

In the late afternoon, his chief aide-de-camp would come to him and ask who he wished to be invited to dinner. Atatürk would insist that this list be related to the books he had been working on or reading that day, and would have it drawn up accordingly. I must point out here that, throughout Atatürk's era, prominent figures in their respective fields were always gathered around him. For this reason, it was always possible to meet and converse with the country's intellectuals in that circle. This was not only the case in Ankara and Istanbul, but also whenever he travelled to various parts of the country; the well-known intellectuals of that region would be invited to these gatherings. However, the people on the list drawn up by the chief aide-de-camp each evening would sometimes be unable to attend due to prior commitments or other reasons; consequently, those named on the lists did not always gather together, or even after they had gathered, others might be summoned. Statesmen, particularly the Prime Minister and the Ministers of the Interior and Foreign Affairs, could attend whenever they wished.

Now, on the occasion of publishing some handwritten documents in this book, I wish to provide information about the events I witnessed. However, I would ask for your understanding if I speak of my own professional life.

In 1929–1930, I began my teaching post at the Ankara School of Music Teachers, where I was assigned to teach civics and history. When Atatürk saw the textbook I intended to use for civic education, he did not consider it sufficient. As the topics in the book were of interest to him as well, he first asked me to make some translations from the 'Instruction Civique' textbook I had studied at the French Lycée. At the same time, he had his Secretary-General, Tevfik Bıyıkoğlu, research various books on these subjects and arrange for translations from German. Drawing on what he had read in French and Turkish, as well as these translations, he wrote certain sections himself or dictated them to us—that is, to me and the Secretary-General. My work at that time consisted of searching for, reading and, where necessary, translating books on these subjects and taking notes. In this way, I delivered my civic education lessons in accordance with the curriculum, based on these new studies. At the school, male and female pupils studied together; under the laws in force at that time, women had not yet been granted the right to vote.

As a practical exercise, I organised mock elections in accordance with the Municipal Code in all the classes I taught. The pupils worked enthusiastically on this task and prepared ballot boxes. The Municipal Code in force at the time was applied to the letter, and they elected one of their female classmates as mayor. I then encountered an objection from a male pupil. He said: "According to what the current law teaches us, women not only do not have the right to vote, but they cannot be elected either." The student was right in his objection, but as a teacher, I deemed it appropriate to offer the following advice: "What you have learnt here will be necessary for your future. Our women will soon gain the right to vote,' I said. However, it was certain that these words of mine would not carry any weight beyond my authority as a teacher in the eyes of that male student.

It was thus this objection and the questions raised by one of my students that encouraged me to work on women's rights.

On the same day, at the Marmara Pavilion in Gazi Orman Farm, I recounted this incident to Atatürk and the Minister of the Interior, Şükrü Kaya, and expressed my regret that, as Turkish women, we did not possess the right to vote.

Atatürk advised me to look into this matter and to investigate how such issues had been resolved in other countries. I must admit that at the time I had virtually no knowledge on the subject. However, I did not wish to appear before my female and male pupils as a teacher

. It would also have been a heavy burden for me to leave the teaching career and duties I had embarked upon with such enthusiasm. Nevertheless, I could not help but say the following to Atatürk: 'I cannot teach that class without having at least the same rights as my male pupils,' I said. At that moment, the Minister of the Interior, Şükrü Kaya, suggested that this matter could be addressed in the Municipalities Act, which had been under discussion in the UN General Assembly for over a year. Atatürk was pondering. Suddenly he said, 'We shall speak to the Prime Minister, but we must be prepared and ready to debate this matter.' That very evening, he invited statesmen, lecturers from the School of Law (which was not yet a faculty at the time), and others capable of discussing these issues to the Çankaya Mansion. When the subject was raised, the views of those in favour of women's suffrage were discussed, as were those of the opponents. I was enthusiastic, but I could not find entirely convincing evidence. However, from that day onwards, I began to read many books. As I gained more knowledge about the situation in other countries, these debates became increasingly beneficial to me. If we were to examine this issue in the minutes of the Grand National Assembly, we could summarise the situation as follows: in a memorandum submitted to the Grand National Assembly as a government proposal, signed by Prime Minister İsmet (İnönü) on 20 March 1929, the following is stated: 'The draft Municipalities Act, prepared by the Ministry of the Interior and whose submission to the Grand National Assembly was decided at the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 6 March 1929, has been presented together with its explanatory memorandum.'

The issue of women's suffrage was not raised in the lengthy explanatory memorandum accompanying this draft law. However, exactly one year later, on 20 March 1930, a resolution was passed in the Grand National Assembly to treat the debate on the law as a matter of urgency. On Saturday 22 March 1930, Monday 24 March, Thursday 27 March, Saturday 29 March and Monday 31 March, debates and discussions took place on various aspects of this bill. Finally, on Thursday, 3 April 1930, the 164-article Municipalities Act was passed, granting women the right to vote and stand for election. On the same day, at a meeting held in the Türkocağı hall, which Atatürk also attended, I delivered my first lecture on Women's Rights.

In accordance with the 'Yurt Bilgisi' programme, other topics were also prepared in the manner I have described above. I would organise these in line with my lesson plan. I would have some of them printed as leaflets and distribute them to my students. However, the truly fascinating aspect of these topics was the discussions that took place amongst those present at Atatürk's meetings. The subject would be raised amongst statesmen, military officials, lawyers, writers and other intellectuals of the day, and everyone would have the opportunity to express their views and share their knowledge.

The blackboard was one of the main pieces of furniture in the dining room. Those speaking would, if necessary, use it to write or draw to illustrate their ideas. The discussions were conducted in an orderly and proper manner, either chaired by Atatürk himself or by a colleague to whom he had delegated the task. These discussions were very beneficial and, for me in particular, highly instructive. As I always had paper and pen to hand, I would take notes on almost everything. Furthermore, questions would be written down to ensure a more thorough discussion of a particular topic or issue, and guests were asked to come prepared for the following evening. It was quite common for our statesmen to leave with a book each from Atatürk's private library to read. On these occasions, we would discuss our state organisation and laws, and whilst taking the needs of the day into account, we would also consider the principles of civilised norms that might be beneficial to our social fabric. Naturally, the political events of the day, national issues and historical topics would also form part of the discussion. Now, following these explanations, I can list the documents I have in my possession relating to 'Civic Knowledge'—which we have named 'Medeni Bilgiler'—as follows:

1- Translations and various notes.

2- Handwritten first drafts (these are by Atatürk, Tevfik Bıyıkoğlu and myself), containing corrections, additions and deletions.

3- Sections containing further corrections made after the material had been recorded.

4- Files containing information gathered from all state and government organisations (these were subsequently handed over to Recep Peker, and the second volume of 'Civic Knowledge' was published under his supervision).

The brochures and books published following all these writings can be listed as follows:

1- In the form of a brochure and pamphlet: 'Notes on National Knowledge for Turkish Children', Ankara 1929.

2- Separate books for each subject: ‘Elections’ (72 pages), ‘Military Service’ (77 pages), ‘Companies and Banks’ (172 pages), ‘Taxation’ (98 pages). These four books were printed in Istanbul in 1930 (3). 3- The book containing all these topics together (141 pages) is titled “Civic Knowledge for Citizens”. Istanbul, 1930.

4- Those published under the title “Civil Knowledge for Citizens” for use in secondary schools were issued on the following dates: by Order No. 2297 of the Ministry of Education’s Directorate of National Education and Training dated 7 September 1931, and on 7 June 1932 and 1908 (191 pages).

By Order No. 3113 dated 27 June 1933 (302 pages). These books were printed in large numbers. However, with each printing, corrections and additions were made, or certain words were removed. For example, whilst the term ‘Moderate Statism’ (p. 79) appeared in the edition published in 1930, the word ‘moderate’ was subsequently deleted. On the first page of this book, under the heading ‘What does Civic Education cover for citizens?’, there are additions in Atatürk’s own handwriting. ‘The information that teaches citizens their duties and rights in relation to both the state and the government, as well as their mutual relations, and, more generally, the structure of the state, has been compiled under the title “Civic Knowledge”.’ p. 11, Istanbul 1930.

As I explained above, research into all these topics and the debates that took place within Atatürk’s circle have always been of great interest. However, this book needed to be organised in a didactic manner, in accordance with teaching methods, and its style needed to be simplified. In this regard, although I undertook some work to ensure it could continue to be taught in schools, this endeavour was not brought to a conclusion as I devoted all my time to historical subjects and my university studies in Geneva.

The drafts prepared for these books contain Atatürk’s handwritten notes. I have published almost all of them in one of my books (4). I am providing a few examples of them in this book. I would now like to focus on certain issues. For example, the notes compiled for the section on ‘Nation’ are as follows: Fundamental Law: 1. Unity in political existence, 2. Unity of race, 3. Unity of language, 4. Unity of religion.

Mehmet Emin Bey: 1. Unity of history, 2. Unity of language, 3. Unity of sentiment, 4. Unity of purpose, 5. Unity of interest,

6. Unity of race, 7. Unity of land and climate.

Encyclopaedia: 1. Unity of origin, 2. Physical resemblance, 3. Moral affinity, 4. Historical or political affinity, 5. Residing in the same country.

The conclusion drawn from all these notes and other books read is formulated as follows: ‘A nation is a political and social body comprising citizens bound together by language, culture and an ideal (ulku).’ In this context, based on our constitution (Teşkilatı Esasiye) in force at that time, Atatürk’s note reads as follows: ‘In our view, political power—the national will and sovereignty—belongs to the nation’s collective identity as a unified whole; it is one, indivisible and inalienable.

On the subject of sovereignty, I cannot fail to highlight the importance of the following sentences: ‘Today, the idea of democracy resembles an ever-rising sea. The 20th century has shown that many despotic governments have drowned in this sea. The principle of democracy, regardless of the means by which sovereignty is exercised, essentially requires that the nation possess sovereignty and be ensured of it.”

The writings on rights and duties have been compiled under a separate heading. Atatürk states: ‘The foremost of all rights is the right to life’; all other rights, and the corresponding duties, are based on this right to life. There is no doubt that a person’s right to life binds them to the duty of respecting the right to life of others. One person’s right becomes another’s duty. Where there is a right, there is a duty; and where there is a duty, there is a right... In social life, people can be conceived as existing within a network woven from rights and duties.” Following these statements, another important clarification is that rights and duties are defined by legal principles and enforced by the state. Atatürk’s text reads exactly as follows:

‘By nature, every person desires that the happiest, easiest and most pleasant aspects of life in the society in which they live should fall to them, whilst the strongest disregard those weaker than themselves. As a result, it is impossible to live in peace, tranquillity, security and order. It is only through the legal

and the authority to enforce them. The state determines the rights and duties of every individual. No one may claim a right beyond the established limits. Similarly, no one may be burdened with duties beyond what is prescribed."

The idea added at the end of this section is that, since both the individual and society suffer harm in the event of a violation of these rights or a neglect of these duties, their enforcement and oversight fall to the state institution.

In this connection, I should point out that the concept on which Atatürk read the most books and on which he had us work was the word 'Freedom'. For this reason, the nature of the notes in my possession, apart from those published in the book, is particularly interesting. As well as translations on the subject of freedom, Atatürk also asked some of his friends to define it. For example, Tahsin (Uzer), the Member of Parliament for Erzurum, offers the following definition in his letter dated 25 January 1930: 'It is the individual's possession of all his rights within his country.'

On another sheet, there is the following explanation by a person whose handwriting I cannot recognise:

'It is the ability of individuals to use, as they see fit, the remainder of the rights they have voluntarily relinquished to society.' On the reverse of the same document, there is a note written in a different hand:

1- Freedom is a concept that negates itself within itself.

Among these small pieces of paper, the definition written in Atatürk's own hand is very brief: 'Freedom is the ability of a person to do exactly what they think is right.'

Following these notes, there are lengthy writings by Atatürk on the subject of 'freedom'. These were penned in January and February 1930.

These notes provide a comprehensive explanation of freedom. 'Freedom is the ability of a person to do exactly what they think and wish, without any influence or interference from another person. This is the broadest definition of the word "freedom". People have never possessed, nor can they ever possess, freedom in this sense. For it is well known that man is a creature of nature. Nature itself is not absolutely free; it is subject to the laws of the universe."

Subsequent explanations then describe how, throughout history, under absolute regimes, the freedom of individuals lay entirely in the hands of the ruler, and how, for centuries, individuals have fought for their personal freedoms. Atatürk's essay concludes with the following statement:

'The foundation of the theory of individual rights is established as follows: The source of every right is the individual. For the only creature that is by nature free and accountable is the human being. However, on the other hand, it is natural and necessary for human beings to exist in social and political organisations. These organisations, in turn, correspond in part to the provisions of necessary and inevitable laws," it is noted; following this, it is argued that the state, which guarantees individual liberty and rights, must be a developed institution. Nevertheless, in Atatürk's subsequent statements, it is accepted that the power ensuring social and civil human freedom, based on individual liberty, must exist within the structure of the state, and that this is the state's primary duty towards the nation.

On the other hand, 'The degree of individual freedom must not weaken state activity. The consequence of a stateless society or a weak state is a struggle of all against all. This struggle must be moderated in such a way as not to stifle the freedom of the majority. Such adjustment must not be taken to a degree that would impair the individual's responsibility, initiative and development. Following the reiteration in Article 68 of the Constitution that 'Every Turk is born free and lives free', Atatürk sets out the following provision:

'Turks are democratic, free and responsible citizens.' 'The founders and owners of the Turkish Republic are the people themselves.'

With this statement, Atatürk emphasises the importance of valuing the nation as a whole.

'The foundations and principles of being a "civilised citizen" within the concept of freedom are thus explained. For example, "As a nation's culture (hars) advances, the stages of application of individual freedom expand and multiply. Various forms of individual freedoms, distinct and independent from one another, emerge. These freedoms are divided into two groups according to their nature and character: 1. Personal freedom.

2- Social freedom. Within this second group, freedom of the press and the press's role in shaping public opinion have been explained at considerable length. However, the main idea is summarised in the following sentence:
'The greatest truths and advances arise and flourish through the free expression and exchange of ideas.'
Nevertheless, the idea that citizens have duties and responsibilities corresponding to all their civil rights has been expressed in parallel throughout these writings. For this reason, Atatürk states: 'The more citizens' sense of initiative and responsibility develops, the better it is for the state.'
Atatürk, who recognised the equality of citizens' rights as a fundamental provision of the constitution—as a consequence of freedom—stated: 'Equality means equality before the law.' In the subjects Atatürk addressed through these 'civic lessons'—and which he also set us to work on—there are principles that form the foundation of our Republic, principles that conform to the law and the general legal principles of our age. He sought to pair every right he granted to Turkish citizens with a corresponding duty. In response to the proverb 'Idleness is the mother of all evils', he emphasised that work is both an individual and a social duty. As a member of the nation, the citizen has duties towards the family and society. Particular emphasis has been placed on the fact that 'the nation, as a family within civilised humanity, has duties towards all of humanity'. Thus, Atatürk identified the greatest civilised attribute of the Turkish citizen as being part of the nation as a whole—a community of free, equal individuals who possess rights and duties and are conscious of their responsibilities within the civilised world. In the following sections, I have compiled examples from K. Atatürk's works and handwritten notes, as well as gathering together the statements he made on various subjects. Through these examples, I am presenting some insights into the intellectual life of a statesman.

1. SHORT QUOTES I HAVE NOTED FROM M. KEMAL ATATÜRK

The force that governs people's lives and activities is creativity (ibda) and the capacity for invention.
1930 There is no issue that reason and logic cannot resolve.
Revolution.
It means dismantling the institutions that have held back the Turkish nation in recent centuries and replacing them with new institutions that will ensure the nation's progress in accordance with the highest civilised standards. 1933 The republican system means a democratic system and a form of government. We have established the republic; as it reaches its tenth year, we must implement all the requirements of democracy in due course. Recognising women's rights will also be a requirement of this. Rest assured. 1933
A revolution is carried out by preparing the nation and the social environment.
The key point to bear in mind in revolutionary movements is that, having identified the aspirations and ideas of human societies, one must then persuade them to accept the innovations.
The revolution must be completed.
We have written history as we have lived it, but the future must be entrusted to those who believe in the Republic, who protect it and who will keep it alive.
It is essential for a child to have been brought up having gone through the normal stages of schooling and education.
You must regard students, whatever their age or year group, as the leaders of the future and treat them accordingly. 1930
Nurture the youth. Impart to them the positive ideas of science and knowledge. It is through them that you will attain the brightness of the future. When free thought is put into practice, the Turkish nation will rise.
A person may achieve great success in their life, but if they choose to rest on their laurels, that success is doomed to be forgotten. Therefore, working hard and constantly striving for success must be the guiding principle for everyone.
If a person has accomplished a successful endeavour in their life, that endeavour has become the property of history and the nation. If that person chooses to rest on their laurels, it will lead them into idleness and deprive them of further successes.

Life is a source of progress and dynamism. One is obliged to adapt oneself to it. One must overcome pride in times of success and resist despair in times of disaster. 1930
Our forefathers, who founded great states, also possessed great and comprehensive civilisations. It is our duty to seek out and investigate these, and to make them known to the Turkish nation and the world.
Just as with nations, if the past serves as a foundation for individuals, one must build upon it and focus on the details.
These structures must rise in accordance with the level of human civilisation; they must be solid and durable.
Let us always speak of new things and of humanity's progress along the path of civilisation. This will give us speed and strength for the future.
In response to the question, 'Which do you consider to be your greatest work?', I say:
The work I have done consists of things that are interconnected and necessary. However, do not ask me about what I have done, but rather about what I am yet to do.
We do not adopt Western civilisation merely to imitate it. We embrace those aspects of it that we deem suitable for our own context, within the context of global civilisation.
Regarding the wolf-headed symbols designed for the state coat of arms:
None of these can serve as the coat of arms for a new state established in today's world. The state coat of arms should be represented by a symbolic human head.
In this world, everything originates from the human mind. I cannot conceive of anything that a human head could not express.
Throughout history, humankind has at times been a prisoner of nature and at other times its master, and this state of affairs has evolved in proportion to the progress of human societies in civilisation.
Back in 1919, as we crossed the mountain peaks of Anatolia in our ramshackle cars with their wheel wells stuffed full of sacks, I made it a habit to have those around me sing this march.

Smoke shrouds the mountain
peaks, The Silver Stream
flows ceaselessly, The sun
now rises from the horizon,
Let's set off, my friends

Where is this sea of sky?
Where are these
mountains and rocks?
These trees and beautiful
birds? Let's walk on,
friends

May the earth, sky and water hear
our voices; may every place
resound with our firm footsteps
When he saw the great trees of Istanbul:
'These are lovely too, but we want to see the trees of Ankara—whose leaves and branches we watch grow year after year—to multiply.'
Upon seeing a branch of almond blossoms in a vase:
'How lovely that spring has come,' he said, and immediately added: 'But these beautiful flowers will wither without bearing fruit and will only satisfy our visual pleasure for a few days—what a pity!' 1938.
Upon seeing a jujube tree being uprooted at the Forest Farm:
The jujube was an old and spindly tree. Yet it was a living tree that scattered its lovely scents around in spring. We must replant it. 1937
Tell me about the beautiful wooded places in our homeland that you know; let's go there, so I can wander beneath the trees and embrace a simple life. My longing is for greenery and woodland, but to be amongst trees that remain green all year round. 1938
In this era when the world is heading towards a general war, we must be much stronger economically

. The government must prioritise the implementation of the economic plan. 1938 As a nation, we must prepare for the perilous days of the future by becoming economically strong. 1938 We have not yet achieved stability in our native language; much, much more work is required. 1938 We must not lose heart in the face of difficulties.

If I were the sort of person who would lose heart in the face of a thousand and one difficulties, my nation would have left me alone and on my own in the guidance of great undertakings. I am always grateful for my nation's goodwill.

2. MY WRITINGS ON M. KEMAL ATATÜRK

On the multi-party system:

'The important lessons of caution and awakening that people can draw from history; in my view, must be the conclusions drawn from an examination of the causes and factors that have generally influenced the formation of states and political institutions, the alteration of their nature, and their disintegration and collapse. For example, just as the conclusions drawn from an examination of the causes and factors that led to the emergence of the Ottoman Empire are significant, so too are the conclusions to be drawn from an examination of the causes and factors behind its decline. In such studies, the level of civilisation of the nations that established the political institution is, of course, examined from every perspective; the positive or negative influences of individuals are also taken into account.

As an example of the transformation of political institutions, we may also analyse a contemporary event. Under the influence of well-known causes and factors, the Republic of Turkey was established. A political party was formed, based on the Society for the Defence of Rights (the Republican People's Party). Certain political groups that were intended to be organised in opposition to this party were unable to survive, as they lacked the spirit of republicanism. The Republican People's Party remained the sole political party in the country. The plenary assembly of the Grand National Assembly consisted entirely of members of this party. The President of the Republic and members of the government were drawn from the ranks of this party; they were individuals elected and endorsed by the party's parliamentary group. The fundamental principles of the Republican People's Party and the present government, which implements these principles, possess the qualities and nature necessary to consolidate the foundations of the republic. That this is the case can be readily understood from the stance, actions and achievements observed over the years. However, there are significant drawbacks associated with the continuation of this situation. The first drawback that can be mentioned is that, as the Assembly consists solely of members of a single party, the actions of the government held in power by that party have not been sufficiently debated or criticised. This shortcoming may arise from two causes.

Firstly, the Assembly may place too much trust in the President, who is a member of its own party, and in the Prime Minister and his colleagues whom he has appointed. For this reason, they may not deem it necessary to scrutinise at length the matters that pass through the Assembly or those that do not. Secondly, being members of the same party may give rise to an unnecessary and harmful sense of sensitivity amongst colleagues.

A misguided notion that they must not offend one another through criticism and censure may arise. Other reasons may also come into play; gradually, the government and the President who elected it become accustomed to exercising, without criticism, the powers they have received from Parliament and those they may acquire in connection with certain important and exciting events. This situation may become deeply entrenched to the point of becoming the norm. For it is easier to act with little or no criticism than to act whilst anticipating that every move will be subject to criticism; it is difficult to predict what form this situation will take over time.

If the individual who assumes the presidency of the state is particularly powerful and active, and renders great services to the state and the nation that will earn him personal affection and esteem, whilst outwardly appearing to be highly respectful and obedient to the position of Parliament and the republican form of government, the danger grows. Even if unintended, the true nature of the state may change. It is only a matter of time before this new nature takes on a new name. It is precisely on the basis of this fundamental consideration that a new party, the Free Republican Party, has been formed, apparently with the approval and encouragement of President Gazi. The existence of this party, formed around sound principles and set to rise naturally upon the foundation of the Republic, constitutes a fundamental precaution to prevent the potential dangers that come to mind from materialising. Within the country, the Republican People's Party and the Free Republican Party will keep each other in check,

and will enlighten public opinion regarding each other's ideas, intentions and actions. In this way, actions taken on the basis of personal authority will be held before the eyes of the nation. It does not lead to a favourable outcome for the nation to be so captivated by individuals that it forgets itself and becomes utterly absorbed. There are many examples of this in history.
Under Octavian, the Roman Republic, which had endured for five hundred years, quietly and gradually transformed into an absolute monarchy. Octavian always paid attention to and respected the Senate. He sought to preserve appearances. He did not provoke the supporters of liberty into discontent.
Octavian refused the consulship on condition that he be allowed to live; he never accepted the dictatorship. Augustus worked for the good of all. Public opinion was on his side. He endeared himself to the Senate so much that whenever he wished to step down from power, the Senate would plead with him to retain it. The Senate bestowed the title of 'Augustus' upon Octavian. Until then, this title had been reserved solely for the deities. With this new title, Octavian acquired a certain sacredness. It was precisely these honours that led Octavian to gradually concentrate all military and civil power and authority within himself. An Augustan era lasting 44 years was sufficient to consign the Republic to oblivion. After Augustus, emperors—including Nero—held the throne in Rome until they brought about the downfall of the Roman state." (1930)

What does civilisation mean?

'There are those who define civilisation in various ways. In my view, it is both difficult and unnecessary to distinguish civilisation from culture. To explain this point of view, let me define what culture means:
a) The sum total of what a human society is capable of achieving in its political life, b) in its intellectual life—that is, in science, social life and the fine arts, c) and in its economic life—that is, in agriculture, crafts, trade, and land, sea and air transport."
When we speak of a nation's civilisation, I believe it consists of nothing other than the sum of the three types of activity we classify under the term 'culture'. Undoubtedly, the level of culture—that is, civilisation—cannot be the same for every human society. Just as these differences are evident separately in the realms of the state, ideas and economic life, so too are they apparent in the sum of these three. What is important is the difference in these outcomes. A high level of culture does not remain confined to the nation that possesses it; it exerts its influence on other nations as well. It extends to vast continents. Perhaps for this reason, some nations refer to a high and comprehensive culture as 'civilisation'—such as 'European civilisation' or 'contemporary civilisation'.
In the concept of 'culture', they confine it to certain racial and innate traits—characteristics of nature—of nations that are strong and slow to change, and they attach great value and importance to these. For example, when considering the conquest of Istanbul, there are those who say: 'The Byzantines were more civilised than the Turks, but the Turks prevailed and succeeded because their culture was stronger.' This view and explanation are incorrect. In truth, the Turks were not only more civilised than the Byzantines, but their racial character was also superior to theirs. If we examine the event by bearing in mind the three key elements of what we call civilisation, our view becomes readily clear.
The Turks who captured Istanbul were, of course, far superior to the Byzantine Empire in terms of state administration. The ships, cannons and all manner of equipment they constructed and invented during the conquest of Istanbul, the high level of scientific expertise they demonstrated—particularly the ingenuity of transporting an entire fleet overland from Dolmabahçe the Golden Horn—are clear evidence of just how far ahead the Turks who conquered Byzantium were in the realms of thought and science. I would also like to recall that Byzantine princes undertook apprenticeships in Turkish encampments and received instruction in every respect. It is well known that even in Attila's time, the Eastern Roman Empire was at such a lower level in politics and military affairs that it had become a tributary of the Turks. There is no need to explain that the Turks who conquered Byzantium were far ahead of the Byzantines in economic life. In short, civilisation is nothing other than culture. Culture should not be reduced to the concept of character, which we might call 'seciye'. This view I have put forward facilitates the definition, explanation and understanding of civilisation and culture, which are otherwise difficult to distinguish from one another." (1930)

What does ‘culture’ mean?

‘If I were not the President of the Republic, I would wish to take on the post of Minister of Education,’ he said. Atatürk also explained culture as follows:
‘The foundation of the Republic of Turkey is culture. I see no need to explain this statement further here, as it has been established in the schools of the Republic of Turkey on numerous occasions.
Culture is to read, to understand, to perceive, to derive meaning from what one perceives, to take note, to think, and to cultivate the intellect.
Furthermore, through one’s own energy and with nature’s inexhaustible assistance—which is bestowed upon one—the rising and expanding human intellect becomes a distinctive quality that allows one to say, ‘I am human’, in the sense of boundless comprehension.
Humanity is the expression of movement and activity—that is, dynamism. Consequently, culture is an essential element, as we have indicated above, for becoming truly human in the sense of our humanity.
Let us explain this briefly. Culture is to find happiness in the sublime blessings of nature. This expression encompasses many things. Purity, innocence, nobility, humanity, and so on… All these are attributes of humanity. When we take the word ‘culture’ in its infinitive form, it means nature bestowing the noble qualities it has given to humankind upon its own children, grandchildren and future generations.
What we have sought to explain thus far is that the children of today’s Republic of Turkey are cultured people. In other words, they are not only possessors of culture themselves, but are also convinced that they are spreading this quality to their surroundings and to the entire Turkish nation.”

What are the causes of historical events?

‘The causes of historical events may primarily be political, military, social and economic. More often than not, these causes exert their influence in a complex interplay. There is no doubt that all these factors are of great importance. However, in my view, the most important factor directly related to a nation’s very existence, its rise and its decline is its economy. This is a truth established by history and experience. This truth is also fully evident in our national life and national history.
If Turkish history is examined, it becomes clear that, amongst the many causes, the root of all rise and fall lies in nothing other than economic matters. In this regard, we can say that, in order to raise the Republic of Turkey to the level it deserves, we must attach the utmost importance to our economy. If we consider that we are living in an era dominated by economics, the extent of this importance becomes readily apparent.
The primary requirements for the development of the economy—roads, railways, ports, and means of land and sea transport—are the material and political lifelines of the nation. They are the means to prosperity and strength.” (1930)
The earliest civilisations

‘Let us set aside the Stone Ages of humanity. In the Metal Age, artefacts made from various metals and bones included all manner of tools and ornaments. Bricks, bowls and pots made from clay were among the first artefacts produced by early humans. Domesticating animals, utilising them in various ways, and keeping them in herds were among the first tasks undertaken by humans. Agriculture is another such example. Furthermore, depending on the region they inhabited, people also built structures from mud bricks, bricks or stone. Digging canals, draining marshes and developing various methods of irrigation were also among the first things discovered by humankind. It was the ancient people who lived thousands of years ago who, through observing the sun and the stars, established the basis of the calendar and discovered that nature is the greatest force. It was these people who built ships and demonstrated the ability to sail the seas, and who learnt to trade. It was also they who established the first societies and state institutions based on the principles of democracy. All these achievements we have mentioned are the first civilised works in the world and in all of humanity.

The homeland of the Turks is the Central Asian plateau."
Written for me on the occasion of the opening of the Faculty of Language, History and Geography for my first lecture:

The Distinction Between Sounds

'In nature, as you know, nothing ever ceases to exist. Neither a sound, nor a word, nor a movement… however ancient or recent the era in which they occurred, all these phenomena remain within nature just as they were at the moment of their occurrence. In this flux, there is no concept of time or distance. We can see that it is possible to hear, listen to and record a word spoken or a movement made in any corner of the world at the very same moment in another corner of the world.
Tomorrow, it will certainly be possible to gather and record, exactly as they were, the words spoken thousands upon thousands of years ago, amidst the elements of nature that surround us. Human intellect, which is undoubtedly set to penetrate the mysteries of nature, will reveal the truths we await.
It is this same human intellect which, whilst not yet having achieved the result we hoped for, has discovered new methods and sciences that will satisfy today's inquisitive minds and shed light on history.
Archaeology and anthropology are at the forefront of these sciences. History becomes well-founded only when it is based on the evidence uncovered by these modern sciences. It is nations whose history is grounded in such evidence that discover and recognise their own origins.
Our history, Turkish history, is based on these scientific documents. All that is required is for today's enlightened youth to recognise and promote these documents directly."

Another article on the same subject

'Human intellect, which delves ever deeper into the mystery-filled bosom of nature, has discovered and established sciences that will satisfy those striving to grasp reality and shed light on human history. From a historical perspective, archaeology and anthropology are at the forefront of these sciences. History becomes well-founded only when it is based on the documents uncovered and brought to light by these sciences. It is nations whose history is based on these documents that discover and recognise their true selves and origins. Indeed, our history—Turkish history—is based on these scientific documents. That is why every fragment of our historical documents is also the mother of those cultural works considered classical." (*) (January 1936)

On Literature

'In the Ottoman period, in the Republican era that has followed to the present day, in the preceding Turkish cultural eras, and indeed in all cultured and civilised societies, the term "literature" is understood to mean the following:
The art of expressing words and meaning—that is, all manner of knowledge residing in the human mind and the deepest emotions of the human character—in such a way as to deeply engage those who hear or read them. For this reason, literature, whether in prose or verse, has traditionally been regarded as one of the fine arts, just like painting, sculpture and, in particular, music.
Even a highly idealistic profession such as the military—which, by its very nature, is destined to confront life and bloodshed whilst being grounded in the most positive sciences and the most refined technical principles—finds in literature the means to convey itself to the society in which it exists and to prepare for this great journey of humanity and heroism; it finds in literature a means that is inspiring, goal-oriented, guiding, and ultimately self-sacrificing and hero-making.
In this respect, it is readily apparent that literature is one of the most fundamental educational tools for every human community and for every organisation that safeguards and will safeguard the present and future of that community.
For this reason, the Ministry of Culture (Ministry of National Education) of the Republic of Turkey must attach particular importance and value to the following points in the teaching of literature.
a) To shape the mind of the Turkish child in accordance with the care and attention inherent in their natural disposition. This is a duty that also falls within the remit of the ministry responsible for the republic's public health.
b) To open up, disseminate and broaden the well-preserved Turkish mind and intellect. This is, in particular,

the Ministry of Culture. Furthermore, to instil in capable Turkish children the concepts of positive science and material technology, not merely in theory but also through practical means.

c) At the same time, to accustom them to expressing the abilities within their minds, the strength of their character, and the nobility and breadth of their emotions, without any strain, in a natural manner and just as they are.

Once these objectives are achieved, the result will be as follows: when a Turkish child speaks, their manner of expression and narration; and when they write, their style of expression—thanks to this ability to lead their listeners along the path they tread—will enable the Turkish child to convey and instil the lofty Turkish ideal in those who listen to them or read their writing, drawing them along in their wake.

'It is thanks to this approach to literature, and to the teaching of literature of this kind, that it is possible to achieve the objective implied by the concept of literature.' (1937)

WHAT IS THE HIGH VALUE AND INDOMITABLE STRENGTH OF A SOCIAL BODY?

The value and strength of a social body stem from the individuals who constitute it regarding themselves as possessing value and strength. However, it is only social bodies formed by such individuals that can present a unified picture of value and power.

Undoubtedly, just as individual members may possess value and strength, they may also lack them; yet, as long as such individuals are part of a greater collective of value and strength, they may consider themselves to be shareholders in that vast and all-encompassing whole. Those whose aim is not the education of the individual but that of the masses, whilst not necessarily aware of this truth, should not hesitate to regard and present those who can take refuge in this truth—regardless of their shortcomings—as the most cherished members and elements of that great social body. People who perceive and present matters in this way are not to be regarded as mistaken or at fault; on the contrary, they should take satisfaction in the fact that, within the social body to which they themselves are proud to belong, they have demonstrated not only that everyone shares in every honour, but even that they are the very owners of that honour.

I must say that I realised this truth only after I had completed my education, step by step, and had actually entered into life. It will be easier for me to explain this with brief, practical examples… For instance, during certain exercises carried out within a battalion, a regiment, or even a corps or an army, I have at times served as a company commander, a reconnaissance officer, or an observer. I recall that whenever an exercise or manoeuvre was successful, I would immediately take credit for it without looking around me; for I believed I alone had brought about the brilliant outcome of the entire exercise or manoeuvre. In truth, I may well have carried out the duty entrusted to me with great care and achieved success in it; but if I took the liberty of attributing the success of the entire unit to myself, this too must be forgiven; for let us consider that, within that general movement and activity, there were thousands of people like me who carried out their duties with care and honour; let us, of course, accept that each of them thought just as I did; yet had neither my efforts nor those of those thousands of honourable and self-sacrificing people been centralised in a single authority and a single mind, none of us would have had the courage to take pride in what we had done.

People must realise that, from the time before they acquired the status of human beings on this earth right up to the present day, they have been created by their very nature to live in a social state, unable to live alone. It is for this reason that we all speak of it, we all take pride in it, and we can all attribute this honour to ourselves; yet the truth is that honour, dignity and heroism do not belong to any single individual, but to the social body composed of all these individuals.

It is a mistake to establish hierarchical levels of honour within this body; nor is it within the power of that social body to establish hierarchical levels of strength. If such things manifest themselves outside the consciousness of that social body, in what it has produced and may produce, then society will not take offence at these circumstances that have arisen from within itself."

FOR SPORT AND PARADE IMAGES

‘It is the foremost duty of political organisations existing as states to ensure the sanitary conditions of the region in which their children live, so that they may be healthy and robust.

Thereafter, physical activity plays—and must play—an important role at every stage of life, from the earliest years to the very end, that is, throughout the average span of human life.

The basis of physical movement lies in customs passed down from generation to generation. In the twentieth century, the technical principles of sport for all the nations of the world have arisen from this. Like the children of every nation, Turkish children, from the moment they are born, begin by moving their hands, arms and legs in accordance with the movement and activity that nature has instilled in them; and as the child grows, depending on the conditions of their environment, they run and walk in fields, on hillsides, on mountain tops, amongst rocky outcrops and in forests, practising what the modern scientific world calls ‘sport’ quite naturally, without giving a second thought to what they are doing. They wrestle, ride horses, jump, play javelin and engage in many other national sports.

These natural and national sports practised by Turkish village children are perhaps the least successful aspect within the framework of what is today considered ‘civilised’. However, those responsible for organising sporting activities within Turkish society do not engage in sport merely to win competitions for the sake of show when seeking to elevate the sporting lives of Turkish children. The main aim is to ensure physical education for Turks of all ages. Our forefathers did not say the phrase ‘a sound mind resides in a sound body’ for nothing.

It is necessary to teach Turkish children the modern techniques of sport and to showcase some of them as part of the spectacle at certain ceremonies and festivals. To the question of whether this is necessary or not, the following answer may be given:

Essentially, no; however, in the eyes of those who cannot see the truth, it may be deemed necessary to prove an existing and undeniable truth with a small example. Let us explain this with another example:

Is a nation’s army a perfect army, and what is the manifestation (sign) of this? The answer to such a question is as follows:

One must observe the army in the face of the real enemy. However, for a nation, it is not possible to demonstrate this at any given time. Few have the opportunity to demonstrate this on the battlefield; for those deprived of such opportunities, it has generally been accepted to demonstrate the strength, power and majesty of the national army through a series of eye-catching manoeuvres and military formations. These formations and their displays are tasks that are both dazzling and heart-warming. Ever since it was realised that the fundamental discipline of an army must conform not to these artificial forms but to natural ones, the true direction of the army’s training and education programmes has been established.

It is for this reason that shortcomings may be observed in the Turkish Army’s parades, as well as in the Turkish youth’s football and similar sports. For these shortcomings can be eliminated with a little attention and a little training. We should not attach too much importance to this. What matters most to us is that Turkish children love sport and are able to use their physical strength appropriately. We must place particular emphasis on the training and discipline necessary for these children to succeed on the battlefield when they become soldiers. Accordingly, in a parade, the display of our army may not be particularly impressive; we must not regard this as a measure or indication of our army’s high combat capability.

Young Turkish children may not appear as well-trained or as adept at ball games as children of any other nation, but there is no need or reason to be disheartened by this. We see our children demonstrating their true strength, power and intelligence in competitions every day, everywhere, and indeed in every village. It is those who fail to see this who look upon Turkish youth with concern, as if they were incapable of performing grand (showy) feats. Let us reassure them that the truth is not as they perceive it. The Turkish nation and its children, young and old, are statues forged from steel; to understand what they are truly like, one must measure oneself against them on the battlefield. It is precisely such an endeavour that serves as a test of the Turkish youth’s high worth, strength, power and invincible intelligence, which have been recognised for thousands of years.

‘The Turkish nation is ready for such a test at any moment and against anyone’ (1937)

3) VARIOUS TOPICS IN THE HANDWRITING OF M. KEMAL ATATÜRK

Our homeland is the land within our current political borders, where the Turkish nation lives amidst the works that have preserved their existence in the depths of its ancient and illustrious history and territories. The homeland is an indivisible whole that accepts no separation under any circumstances.
The natural and historical factors seen to have played a role in the formation of the Turkish nation are as follows:
a) a) Unity in political existence, b) Linguistic unity, c) Territorial unity, d) Unity of race and origin, e) Historical kinship, f) Moral kinship (affinity).

General definition of the nation:

Having once again noted that the shared past, the history forged together, and the shared language—which directly unites consciences and minds—are the most important factors , let us also adopt a definition of the nation that, whilst disregarding secondary elements as far as possible, is applicable to every nation:
a) Possessing a rich heritage of memory;
b) who are sincere in their shared desire and agreement to live together;
c) And whose wills are united in continuing to preserve that heritage together—the community arising from the union of such people is called a nation.
If this definition is examined, the value, strength and freedom of conscience inherent in the bonds between the people constituting a nation, as well as the respect shown for their shared humanity, become self-evident.
Indeed, the shared legacy of past victories and hardships;
The shared programme to be realised in the future;
Having rejoiced together, having nurtured the same hopes together;
These, of course, take on a meaning and scope that transcends all other conditions in today’s civilised mindset.
Once a nation has been formed, every individual of that nation undoubtedly has a right to a share in and participation in the national culture that arises through the collective efforts of its members in state life, economic life and intellectual life. Accordingly, if we say that a society composed of people sharing a common culture is called a nation, we have provided the shortest definition of a nation.

The principle of nationality:

The principle of nationality refers to the fact that a nation possesses natural or acquired distinctive characteristics in relation to other nations, constitutes an organic entity distinct from other nations, and generally pursues a course of development separate from, yet parallel to, that of other nations.
According to this principle, every individual and every nation possesses the right and freedom to act in good faith regarding their own affairs and to demand unconditional protection of their own territory.
This principle clearly shows us which nations are free and which are deprived of their freedom in one way or another—that is, which are unworthy of the name ‘nation’.

Turkish nationalism:

Turkish nationalism, whilst pursuing the path of terakki (progress) and inkişaf (development) and in international relations and

relations, whilst proceeding in harmony with all contemporary nations and on a par with them, yet preserving the distinctive characteristics and independent identity of Turkish society.

State:

An entity comprising the collective body of individuals settled within a specific territory and possessing its own distinct power.

THE DUTIES OF THE STATE

The state and government established by the nation have duties and powers for which they are accountable to the citizens. If the nature of these duties is examined, the following list may be drawn up:

a) Within the country, to establish and maintain public order and justice, and to safeguard citizens' freedoms of every kind.

b) To safeguard the nation's independence by effectively managing foreign policy and relations with other nations, and by ensuring that all forms of defence forces are always kept ready within the country.

These two duties are among the state's most fundamental responsibilities. It may be said that the purpose of the state's organisation is to ensure the fulfilment of these two duties. For these are tasks which citizens, as individuals, are incapable of performing. Indeed, it is not permissible for citizens to attempt to carry out these duties even in part; for if they did, anarchy would ensue and the state would cease to exist. For example, a citizen cannot, on his own initiative, establish political contact or relations with a foreign state.

A citizen is not authorised to take independent action with a group of people he might gather for the defence of the country.

A citizen may not attempt to secure his own freedom and rights by relying on his own physical strength;

These matters can be secured not through the strength and initiative of individuals, but through the power and influence of the state, which embodies the will of the nation.

In addition to these two types of duty, let us now list, in the order in which we began, the duties which we have indicated fall within the remit of the state.

c) Public works such as roads, railways, etc.,

d) educational matters,

e) Public health services,

f) Social welfare (social security) matters,

g) Economic affairs relating to agriculture, trade and industry.

There are those who argue that the state should not undertake the matters listed last, but should leave them to individuals. Those who endorse and follow this theory are called 'individualists'.

There are also "Statists" who defend the theory that all kinds of economic affairs, just as much as political and intellectual matters pertaining to the general and common interests of the nation, should be carried out by the state rather than left to individuals.

Let us conduct a brief analysis to determine which principle is most appropriate for our state to adopt, taking into account the arguments put forward by 'Individualists' and 'Statists', as well as the defining characteristics of democracy:

'It is well known that the Republic of Turkey is a state founded on the principle of democracy. Democracy, in essence, is political in nature; it is an idea, individualistic and egalitarian.

In accordance with these fundamental principles of democracy, the state's role consists of ensuring citizens' political freedoms and participation, ensuring citizens' right to participate in national sovereignty in accordance with established procedures, and guaranteeing that all citizens possess the same political rights—these are the key

boundaries of the state's duties towards its citizens.
Therefore, a state founded on the principle of democracy is not a system of social welfare, nor is it an economic organisation. For this reason, it is possible for the state to refrain from interfering in matters pertaining to these spheres and to leave all such matters to individuals or to companies composed of individuals. To understand the extent of this possibility, one must consider the relationship and connection between the state's fundamental duties—which it is obliged to fulfil towards the nation and the country—and those duties regarded as secondary.
To ensure public order and to defend the country, the state requires citizens who are in good health, robust, and possess a high level of understanding, national sentiment and love for their homeland.
The state requires highly capable citizens to carry out the nation's affairs both at home and abroad. The state considers it essential that all its citizens understand the laws of the state and recognise the necessity of complying with them, for the sake of the country's public order and defence.
The State is generally concerned with ensuring that citizens succeed in any art or profession to the extent required by the progress of our times.
For this reason, the State is obliged to take an interest in the education, upbringing and health of its citizens.
For the sake of the country's public order and defence, the State is closely concerned with roads, railways, ports, maritime vessels, the telegraph, the telephone, the country's livestock, all means of transport, and the nation's general wealth. In the administration and defence of the country, all these elements are more important than muskets, rifles or any other kind of weapon.
In particular, money is a weapon of existence that surpasses all other means. Although the economic aspects of the matters we have listed do not appear to be among the state's essential duties, they are influential in the fulfilment of those duties. In order to be able to leave these matters entirely to individuals or companies, it is necessary to be certain that, even without state intervention or assistance, these matters will not cause difficulties in the fulfilment of the state's fundamental duties.
It is evident that economic and certain social matters are, on the one hand, related to the interests of individuals. For this reason, individualists regard the state's involvement in these matters as an infringement of personal liberty. However, within these matters, there are also aspects that, by extension, touch upon and relate to the common interest of the entire nation. For this reason, it is appropriate to acknowledge the points on which the statists are correct.
Private interests are, for the most part, at odds with the public interest. Furthermore, private interests ultimately rest on competition.
However, an economic order cannot be established on this basis alone.
Those who hold this view are 'those who allow themselves to be deceived by a mirage'.
Individuals and companies are weaker than state organisations. Free competition also has social drawbacks; such as pitting the weak against the strong in competition... And finally, individuals are unable to satisfy certain major common interests.
In such matters, a broad and powerful organisation may be required which individuals would be unable to establish; yet, as individuals cannot derive sufficient benefit from such undertakings, they abandon them. However, these matters are of vital importance to the nation, and the state is obliged to undertake them.
Undoubtedly, in nations, as freedom and civilisation develop, the duties and responsibilities of the state increase; 'as life expands, so do the means'. Many means are governed by great and substantial power. As power increases, so do the rules. The means and rules of a society are embodied in the state.
Furthermore, the state's ambition differs in nature from that of the individual. It considers the common good and progress of the whole. It is worth examining to what extent it is possible to distance individuals from the pursuit of private interests.
It must surely be deemed permissible to accept, as a matter of principle, the state's regulatory role in certain economic matters, just as it does in political and intellectual affairs. In this case, the difficulty that arises is this: to demarcate the respective spheres of activity between the state and the individual...
Defining the limits of the state's activities in this regard and establishing the rules it will apply; whilst, on the other hand, ensuring that the citizen's freedom of individual enterprise and activity is not threatened—these are matters that must be considered and determined by those entrusted with the administration of the state. In principle,

the state must not act in the place of the individual. However, it must take into account the general conditions necessary for the individual's development. Furthermore, the individual's personal activity must remain the primary source of economic progress. Not hindering the development of individuals, and ensuring that the state does not, through its own actions, create an obstacle to their freedoms and initiatives—particularly in the economic sphere—is one of the most important principles of democracy. We may therefore say that the point at which the development of the individual begins to face an obstacle constitutes the limit of state activity. Accordingly, 'in general, the state may undertake an economic activity that exhibits a permanent, specific character in terms of time and place'. For example, the state may undertake an activity that requires large-scale and systematic administration, poses a risk of being monopolised by private individuals, or meets a general need. The administration by the state of mines, forests, canals, railways and shipping companies, as well as the nationalisation of banks issuing currency; likewise, the provision of services relating to water, gas, electricity and the like by local authorities, are examples of the type of activities explained above.

In the sense and understanding we have explained, 'statism is, above all, social, moral and national'. In the distribution of national wealth, greater justice and a higher standard of living for those who labour are essential for the preservation of national unity. It is the vital duty of the state, as the representative of national unity, to keep this requirement constantly in mind.

The expansion of public institutions serving the public interest is a matter the state must give serious consideration to. In this way, purely profit-driven activities are curtailed. This is a significant factor that contributes to the development of moral solidarity amongst citizens.

Having emphasised that individual initiative is indispensable to the state for the increase of all forms of production in the country, we must state that 'the state and the individual are not adversaries, but complement one another.'

When we speak of the 'state' and the 'individual', we do not mean the abstract meanings of these terms; rather, we refer to the 'social human being'—the sole reality—that is, individuals living within society. This human being has two kinds of interests. Some of these interests are personal; others are common. It is these common interests that sustain the life of society. On closer reflection, these two types of interest are equivalent. For both are equally essential to the life of the social human being. Accordingly, in our view, the terms 'state' and 'individual' are two expressions that denote and explain the social human being, whether one is considering the general or the particular interest. In other words, we do not conceive of the individual in isolation, nor of the state as something abstract from individuals. The state is the visible form of the national community constituted by individuals. However, the individual must receive the income from their labour, whilst the state must receive the income derived from social development.

Let us consider how these considerations relate more closely to our own situation.

Our Republic is still very young. The vital undertakings inherited from the past are not yet sufficient to meet the demands of the times. Just as in political and intellectual life, it would be wrong to expect results solely from the initiatives of individuals in economic matters. Important and large-scale undertakings should, as far as possible, be undertaken and accomplished by the government—which is charged with organising the application and exercise of national sovereignty—by relying on the nation's collective wealth and the state's entire organisation and strength. Many matters which other states might regard as secondary—and which could be left to individual initiative without any objection—are vital for us and must be counted amongst the state's primary and most important duties.

In summary, it is appropriate for those governing the Republic of Turkey to act in accordance with the principle of statism, whilst remaining faithful to the principles of democracy, given the current circumstances, conditions and necessities we face.

The principle of statism that we deem appropriate to follow is not a system—such as collectivism or communism, which are based on the socialist principle of taking all means of production and distribution away from individuals and aiming to organise the nation entirely according to different principles—that leaves no room for private or individual economic enterprise and activity.

Work:

Work is a universal law; even the wealthy, as income earners, cannot be exempt from this law; they must use their existing wealth in a manner that contributes to the increase of national wealth. A wealthy person may be exempt from physical labour; however, in that case, they must direct their activities towards intellectual pursuits.
Engaging in fruitless pursuits does not count as work. Doing nothing, or engaging in fruitless, meaningless activities, is a grave offence against the law of work.
What great pleasure a person feels when they see the work they have done growing and improving, whether in their hands or in their mind.
Work develops people's physical strength and provides the essentials of life. Without work, intellectual development and moral progress are also impossible.
'Idleness is the mother of all evils.' THE SUBSTANCE OF

THE PRINCIPLE OF DEMOCRACY

The principle of democracy appears today to be the defining characteristic of modern constitutional systems.
Monarchy and oligarchy can no longer be regarded as anything other than outdated, transient forms.
Admittedly, there are still states with monarchs at their head. However, almost all of them have adopted the principle of democracy.
It is now rare for a monarch to have the audacity to claim to be the holder of sovereignty.
A nation's practical proclamation of the principle of democracy is the result of the social strength of that nation's majority. When a nation becomes sufficiently strong, it seizes power and authority. This event sometimes comes about through revolution and sometimes through an amicable agreement with the monarch.
Today, the idea of democracy resembles an ever-rising tide.
The twentieth century has witnessed many despotic governments being swept away by this tide. The Russian Tsardom, the Ottoman Sultanate and Caliphate, and the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires are among the most notable examples.
Furthermore, it was observed that moderate monarchies, such as Portugal, which were governed by democratic principles, were superseded by republics, which entailed a more explicit application of democracy.
Finally, today it is evident that great, long-established democracies such as Britain and Belgium are working towards the realisation of a more distinct and better-organised form of democracy.
Although the idea of democracy is a hallmark of modern constitutional systems, the concept itself is very ancient.
To properly illuminate the content and meaning of the idea of democracy, it is useful to recall its brief definition.

The historical development of the principle of democracy:

Seven thousand years ago, in Mesopotamia, the principle of democracy was practised among the Sumerians, Elamites and Akkadians, who founded humanity's first civilisation. Indeed, these peoples had established a unified state. Subsequently, Greek city-states such as Athens and Sparta were governed by a form of democracy.
Rome, too, experienced democratic life.
The Turkish nation, in its earliest history, demonstrated its deep attachment to the idea of democracy through its famous kurultays, where the heads of state were elected. In more recent historical periods, however, the sultans who came to power in the states established by the Turks deviated from this system and became despots.
Religion served as a foundation for the despotism of kings and sultans. Kings, caliphs and sultans relied on divine law, encouraged by the priests and clerics surrounding them. The theory that sovereignty had been bestowed upon these rulers by God was fabricated. According to this, the ruler was accountable only to God, and the limits of his power and sovereignty could be found solely in the religious scriptures.

In the face of this principle of absolutism, grounded in divine law, the initial stance adopted by the principle of democracy was a modest one. It sought, at first, not to overthrow the ruler, but merely to limit his powers and abolish absolutism. This endeavour began some 400–500 years ago. It was first stated that power derives from the people and that, should power fall into the hands of an unfit ruler, it must be exercised by an assembly composed of the people's representatives, which would be capable of reclaiming it.
In the 16th century, the principle of democracy was used as a means of political struggle to curtail the influence of monarchs.
The ideas ultimately put forward in these struggles were as follows:
Power belongs to the people.
It has been entrusted to a monarch within the bounds of the law. In certain circumstances, it may be reclaimed.
It was in the 18th century that the idea of democracy took on the form of an irresistible force and movement.
The principle of democracy took the form of the principle of national sovereignty and was enshrined in the constitution.
The notion of a contract between the people and the sovereign had now vanished. In its place emerged the idea that 'sovereignty is indivisible and inalienable'.
They explained this idea as follows:
Sovereignty is the general will, which transcends the wills of individuals and is rooted in the collective social personality of the nation formed by those individuals. Consequently, sovereignty is one; it cannot be divided into parts, and the collective will expressed by sovereignty can never be transferred or relinquished by the nation—the collective personality that possesses it—to any other party.

The defining characteristics of the principle of democracy:

The principle of democracy, regardless of the means by which sovereignty is exercised, essentially requires that the nation possess sovereignty and retain it.

Let us explain this point in a few words:

a) Democracy is, by its very nature, political in character.
Democracy is not a system of social welfare or an economic organisation. Nor is democracy a matter of material prosperity. Such a theory seeks to lull citizens into neglecting their need for political freedom.
The democracy we know is political; its aim is to secure political freedom through the people's oversight of those in power.
b) Alongside its primary characteristic, democracy essentially possesses a second characteristic. This is the idea of democracy itself. It is a matter of the mind; it is certainly not a matter of the stomach. The principle of government also requires a love of justice and a sense of morality.
Democracy is love of one's country; it is, at the same time, fatherhood and motherhood.
c) Democracy is, at its core, individualistic; this characteristic lies in the citizen's participation in sovereignty as a human being.
d) Ultimately, democracy is egalitarian. This characteristic is an inevitable consequence of democracy's individual nature. Undoubtedly, all individuals must possess the same political rights.
From these individual and egalitarian characteristics of democracy arises the principle of universal

and equal suffrage. REPUBLIC

We have previously mentioned nations that have attained sovereignty whilst still having monarchs at their head who retain the status of being God's vicegerent and shadow. Indeed, the states to which these nations belong possess assemblies composed of representatives elected by the people. These assemblies represent the sovereignty of the people. The monarch represents the state; the citizens who form the government are, in theory, appointed by the monarch. However, in reality, the head of government is the leader of a strong political party trusted by the people; the governments formed by these parties

govern the people and the country and are accountable to parliament. As we have explained, these are representative governments; in reality, the principle of democracy prevails, but they are not, strictly speaking, democratic governments.

Democracy, in its fullest sense, requires that the general assembly of the nation should also be in a position to govern, or at the very least that the final will of the state should be expressed and manifested solely by the nation. Regrettably, the size of nations and their levels of intellectual development necessitate that they avoid the imprudence which could lead to a complete deprivation of the ideal in its implementation.

Consequently, the form of government that ensures the most modern and logical application of the principle of democracy is the republic.

In a republic, the final say rests with the parliament elected by the people. It enacts all laws on behalf of the people. It places its trust in the government and may dismiss it. If the people are dissatisfied with their representatives, they elect others at the end of a specified term. The people secure their sovereignty and their participation in the administration of the state only by exercising their right to vote in due course.

In a republic, the government is entrusted to a president, elected for a limited term in accordance with established procedures. The president appoints the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister selects the ministers who will form the government from among the members of parliament in whom he has confidence.

The forms of government around the world vary considerably from one another, albeit with certain differences; nevertheless, all can be categorised under the forms we have discussed: monarchy, oligarchy and popular republic.

There are states that are based on a specific religion (theocratic states). The Russian Tsardom and the Ottoman Sultanate were of this nature. The Tsar was the head of the Church, whilst the Sultans bore the title of Caliph.

Likewise, there are secular governments that have separated religion from politics, such as the Republics of the United States, France and Turkey...

In monarchies, the position of head of state is inherited.

A republic, with a parliament composed of members of parliament and a head of state elected for a fixed term, provides the best foundation for safeguarding national sovereignty.

In a republic, the parliament, the President and the Head of Government do nothing other than consider and strive to ensure the freedom, security and well-being of the people. For they know that it is the nation—the holder of the will and sovereignty—that has placed them in positions of power and authority for a specific period; and they also know that they have been appointed to these positions not to exercise absolute power, but to serve the nation. Should they abuse their position and duties towards the nation, they may, in one way or another, be subject to the manifestation of the national will, even in matters concerning themselves. For those authorised by the people, and on their behalf, to administer the state, the obligation to be accountable to the people when required is incompatible with negligence and arbitrary action.

On the other hand, a ruler who regards the state as an inherited fiefdom, assuming that his power and authority derive from God and that he is accountable only to Him in the Hereafter, considers himself exempt from all constraints. Under such a regime, the nation’s identity and freedom cannot even be a matter of discussion. Consequently, even if its authority is limited, the form of monarchy is not compatible with the principle of national sovereignty inherent in democracy. The fact that government is in the hands of a limited number of people or classes is a situation that the nation’s very existence can never accept. This system (oligarchy), which prevents the entire nation from participating in the administration of the state, is nothing other than the usurpation of the sovereignty belonging to the entire nation by a select group for the sake of securing their own interests.

MODERN CURRENTS OPPOSED TO DEMOCRACY

We have defined the distinctive characteristics of democracy, which forms the fundamental principle of our state organisation. This concept of democracy is subject to attack by certain theories.

I- The Bolshevik theory,

II- the theory of revolutionary political syndicalism,

III- The theory of the representation of interests.

Let us briefly explain our theory of democracy:

I- Let us consider the form in which the Bolshevik theory was applied in Russia: a minority comprising workers, sailors and soldiers from within the entire Russian nation united under the name of the Communist Party, based on economic principles, and established a dictatorship. Their aims are not national in character. They recognise neither individual liberty nor equality. They have no regard for popular sovereignty. Domestically, they compel the majority to submit to their views through force and coercion; abroad, they endeavour to impose their principles on all the nations of the world through propaganda and revolutionary organisations.

Yet the primary aim of establishing a government is, first and foremost, to guarantee individual freedom. A Bolshevik-style government is characterised by despotism. A system of government that forces a society to live as captives and slaves to the views of a certain group of people cannot be regarded as a natural or reasonable form of government (*).

II- The theorists of revolutionary political syndicalism are also groups of workers who seek to manipulate all kinds of political organisations solely for their own benefit, and ultimately to seize political power and dominance. Whilst awaiting an opportunity to achieve their aims by force, they occasionally organise general strikes, thereby exerting influence over government officials and securing the resolution of certain matters in their favour; gradually, they make their presence felt. They are exerting their influence in England, France and Germany. In Germany, to satisfy these theorists to some extent, a council of an economic nature has been established alongside the national assembly, with members drawn from their ranks. We, too, have a High Economic Council. However, this is not a body established in response to any pressure, but rather a consultative body created directly by the government because it deemed it beneficial.

III- The theory of the representation of interests holds that, if various professions, trades and businesspeople are regarded as separate groups or small communities within society, each group has interests distinct from the others. Consequently, they argue that each group with specific interests should be represented separately in Parliament. In this scenario, elections would not be determined by the majority of the people, but by these groups, and in proportion to the interests they hold. Once a few of these groups unite in Parliament and assume positions of power, they will work solely in the interests of their own groups. Who will prevent this?

It is for these very reasons that we do not consider this theory, nor any of the preceding ones, to be suitable for our country and our nation. We regard the mutual assistance between the people of the country and members of various classes as being of equal value and nature; we wish to strive to ensure that the interests of all are safeguarded to the same degree and with the same spirit of equality. We are of the opinion that this approach is more suitable for the organisation of the state structure and the general welfare of the nation. In our view, the rights, interests and freedoms of farmers, shepherds, labourers, merchants, artisans, soldiers, doctors – indeed, of any active citizen within any social institution – are equal. In our view, it is only through a government of the people, as we understand it, that the state can be of maximum benefit to the nation and that the nation's security and administration can be effectively managed.

FREEDOM

Freedom is the ability of a person to do absolutely whatever they think and desire. This definition represents the broadest meaning of the word 'freedom'.

In this sense, human beings have never possessed, nor can they ever possess, freedom. For it is well known that human beings are creatures of nature. Nature itself is not absolutely free; it is subject to the laws of the universe. For this reason, human beings are, first and foremost, bound within nature to its laws, conditions, causes and agents. For example, whether or not to be born was not, and is not, within a person's control. Even after being born, from the very first moment, a person is at the mercy of nature and many other creatures. They are in need of protection, nourishment, care and nurturing.

We know that primitive humans feared everything in nature: thunder, the night, a flooding river, wild animals, and even one another. It is inconceivable that a human, whose first emotion and thought was fear, would have attempted to carry out every thought and desire without restraint.

In primitive human groups, the fear of ancestors—and eventually, in large tribes and nations, the fear of God that replaced this fear of ancestors—has instilled boundless restraints in people's minds and actions.

Many customs and traditions, founded upon superstitions and myths, have severely constrained people in their thoughts and actions. So much so that the very concept of a right to personal freedom of thought and action was unknown.

Those who rose to lead communities governed them in the name of God. All rights and authority resided with them. The rights of the individual were not a matter of consideration.

We may summarise our observations thus far as follows: man was first a slave to nature; later, he became a slave to certain men who derived their power and authority from the heavens. As human societies grew and evolved into states, the burden placed upon individuals increased accordingly. The right of the man at the head of the state was regarded as an unlimited, unrestricted and unconditional absolute power. Whether the form of the state was an empire or a republic was of little importance; the individual had no personal rights. In ancient times, even during the highest periods of human civilisation, this was the situation.

The individual's rights were subsumed within the sovereign's divine right. Relying on this right, the sovereign could dispose of his subjects' freedoms as he saw fit; this was not considered a violation of the individual's rights.

No limits were recognised for the sovereign's power other than those derived from religion. The only thing the sovereign was not permitted to do was that which God had forbidden.

As people progressed in intellectual development, they began to reflect more clearly on their own origins; gradually, they became capable of better understanding and appreciating its greatness.

As it became clear that nature is greater than all things and is everything, humankind—as a child of nature—began to understand its own greatness and dignity.

It is only after people have risen to this level of understanding that they have come to the conclusion that all the abilities nature has created in man must be allowed to function freely and develop. This necessity is natural; it is a right granted by nature.

From this point onwards, the struggle for rights and the conflict over rights between the individual, the ruler and the state begins. This struggle constitutes the history of the internal development of states.

In the 16th century, the ideas put forward were as follows: the sovereign, through his decrees and laws, cannot infringe upon either divine right or natural right. Natural right, too, must be regarded as having been established by God. As long as this idea remained the starting point, the foundation of the limits of the sovereign's power was constituted by the concept of divinity and divine will, for natural rights, too, were tied to the same foundation. If the sovereign observed this limit, it was because he regarded this observance as a religious duty; otherwise, no right was recognised whereby an individual could make a claim against the sovereign. The theory of individual rights could only emerge after the concept of natural rights was severed from the foundation of the concept of divinity and brought down from the heavens to earth.

The foundation of the theory of individual rights was established as follows: the source of all rights is the individual. For the only creature that is rational, free and accountable is the human being.

Accordingly, the individual's absolute independence—constrained only by natural rights and moral responsibility—is regarded as the starting point, preceding all civil institutions.

However, on the other hand, it is also natural and necessary for human beings to exist within social and political organisations.

These structures, in turn, evolve in accordance with the provisions of laws that are partly necessary and predestined. To the extent that a predestined course of events exists, and to the extent that reason is capable of discerning the course and direction of this predestination, human freedom and governance are compelled to conform to this predestination. People are compelled to adapt their actions to the course and direction of this destiny. This state of compulsion and necessity, in truth, serves to make an inevitable outcome more perfect and harmonious. The members of a nation, which is the product of nature and history, are constantly confronted with this truth and show it due respect. The foundation and purpose of the state established by such a nation is, too, the rights of the individual.

The individual's primary right is to be able to freely develop their natural abilities. The best means of ensuring this development is to permit the individual, without infringing upon the equal rights of others and with the risk and harm being borne by the individual themselves,

to direct and manage their own life as they see fit.
It is precisely the guarantee of this free development that constitutes the ultimate purpose of the various freedoms comprising individual rights.
A political community that fails to respect these rights has failed in its fundamental duty, and the state loses the wisdom and meaning of its existence.
In modern democracy, individual freedoms have acquired a special value and importance; interference by the state or by anyone else in individual freedoms is no longer a matter of consideration. However, what such a lofty and valuable individual freedom signifies for a civilised and democratic nation cannot be explained by the absolute meaning of the word 'freedom'. The freedom in question is social and civil human freedom.
For this reason, when considering individual freedom, the common interest of every individual and, ultimately, of the entire nation, as well as the existence of the state, must be borne in mind. It is clear that individual freedom cannot be absolute; the rights and freedoms of others and the common interest of the nation place limits on individual freedom. Restricting individual freedom is, in a sense, the very foundation and duty of the state. For whilst the state is an organisation that guarantees individual freedom, it is also obliged to channel all private activities towards general and national objectives. When it is said that 'freedom is the right to act in any way that does not harm others', this implies that the freedom of the citizen is the sole objective, and that the state is regarded merely as a means to ensure this objective. However, it is this very means that will safeguard the general interests and objectives of the nation.
Thus, whilst setting the limits of individual freedom as the limits of others' freedom, it is accepted that individual freedom cannot be restricted beyond the extent required by the nation's general interest. This idea is simple; yet its application is very difficult. For the extent of individual liberty must not undermine the functioning of the state. The consequence of a stateless society or a weak state is a struggle of all against all. This struggle must be moderated in such a way that it does not stifle the liberty of the majority.
This process of moderation must not be taken to a degree that would undermine the individual's responsibility, initiative and development.
The more citizens' sense of initiative and responsibility develops, the better it is for the state.
The extent to which individual freedom must be relinquished varies according to the times and the country in question. Exceptional times call for exceptional measures. Furthermore, the abuse of freedom may necessitate a temporary, yet extensive, restriction of that freedom. The need to recognise all these measures and restrictions embodies the concept and idea of the state. Gauging the severity of these measures and the extent of their limits is a great art. This is the art of statecraft. The degree of accuracy in this art can be seen in the law that delineates the limits of freedoms. For, 'These limits are determined and defined solely by law', as is surely the case. For the sake of the general freedom and happiness of the citizens, it may be required that individuals relinquish certain freedoms only to the extent that they are necessary for the state.
Let us consider the history of the Turkish nation: until very recently, it was impossible not to feel, as if under the dark, bloodstained claws of the despotism, bondage and oppression under which it had been crushed.
To break the chains of despotism and bondage, the Turk staked his life against both internal and external enemies; he engaged in many bloody and perilous struggles; he endured countless sacrifices; he succeeded; and only then did he attain his freedom. For this reason, freedom is the very life of the Turk.
Now, in Turkey, 'every Turk is born free and lives free'.
The Turkish people's current national and political education and high standing have defined their purpose and position.
Turks are democratic, free and responsible citizens; they are the very founders and owners of the Turkish Republic. The individual Turk has ceded to the Republic only that portion of his freedom and interests as stipulated in the Constitution. The Republic utilises this portion of freedom ceded by the individual to ensure the freedom of the individual and the Turkish nation within the country, and their independence vis-à-vis the outside world.

THE VARIOUS FORMS OF FREEDOM

As a nation's culture advances, the spheres of application of individual freedom expand and multiply, giving rise to various forms of individual freedom that are distinct and independent from one another. These freedoms are divided into two groups according to their nature and character.

The freedoms we can include in the first group primarily correspond to the individual's material interests, namely:

1- In the strict sense of the term, this is personal liberty; that is, the right to move about freely, to come and go, to remain within the national territory, or to leave it. (The right and freedom of travel and residence.) Furthermore, it encompasses the security of being protected from arbitrary arrest, imprisonment and punishment.

2- The inviolability of the home. This right is the foundation and cornerstone of personal security. A person is the owner of their home and may admit only those they wish. Government intervention in a person's home may occur only in the circumstances and in the manner prescribed by law.

3- It is private property. A person's ownership of everything produced by their labour is one of the individual's fundamental rights, into which the state may not interfere. A person may, in good conscience, dispose of their property and possessions as they see fit: they may sell them or not, give them to whomever they wish, or destroy or demolish them. This was not the case in the past; on the contrary, people could be sold, along with the homes they shared with their families, without their consent.

The only restriction on the right to private property is expropriation for the public good. However, the circumstances and necessities under which the government, local authorities and municipal councils may expropriate, as well as the procedures and methods by which they may do so, are regulated by expropriation laws.

Every work of the mind and pen is also the property of its author. This right is protected by the 'Copyright Act'.

4. Freedom of trade, industry and the arts. In order to earn a living, a person is free to work in any occupation, profession or art of their choice. However, this freedom is subject to certain legal restrictions and conditions, imposed reasonably in the public interest. For example, a dairyman or a baker is obliged to comply with certain health regulations. A trader cannot import goods from foreign countries into the country without paying customs duties. Not everyone in the country can practise as a teacher, lawyer or doctor as they please; to do so, they must possess certain qualifications as required by law.

Furthermore, others cannot carry out those activities which the state has reserved for itself in the interests of the state, the public good or public safety. Despite all these restrictions, there is always sufficient freedom of work and economic activity for the individual.

The freedoms falling within the second group are, for the most part, rights relating directly to the individual's intellectual life. Among these,

1- Freedom of conscience: Every individual has the right and freedom to think as they wish, to believe as they wish, to hold their own political views, and to practise or refrain from practising the tenets of a religion of their choice. No one may exert control over another's thoughts or conscience.

Freedom of conscience is absolute and inviolable. It must be recognised as one of the most important of an individual's natural rights. In the dark ages of civilisation, freedom of thought and conscience were subject to domination and oppression, and humanity suffered greatly as a result. In particular, the cruelty and torture inflicted by those cloaked in the guise of religious guardians upon those capable of thinking and speaking the truth will forever remain as dark chapters in the history of humanity.

In the Republic of Turkey, just as every adult is free to choose their religion, the observance of religious rites is also permitted; in other words, freedom of worship is guaranteed. Naturally, religious rites must not contravene public order or general decency; nor may they be conducted in the form of political demonstrations. The Republic of Turkey can no longer tolerate such situations, which were common in the past.

Furthermore, all tekkes, zawiyas and tombs within the Republic of Turkey have been abolished by law. Sufi orders have been dissolved. The titles of sheikh, dervish, celebi, caliph, as well as fortune-telling, sorcery and the office of custodian of a tomb, etc., are prohibited.

For these are sources of reactionary thought and hallmarks of ignorance. The Turkish nation could not and did not tolerate such institutions and their adherents.

2- Freedom of assembly.

3- Freedom of the press.

These two freedoms stem from the same principle. That principle is the right of people to express and publish their ideas freely. Citizens must exchange ideas for their own education and upbringing, and in the interests of the public; they must be able to say what they think as they wish. The greatest truths and advances emerge and flourish through the free expression and exchange of ideas.

An assembly is the temporary gathering of people for the purpose of thinking and discussing together, or of listening to someone speak. The freedom of assembly is one of the rights of individuals under our Constitution, but it takes place within the framework of the Public Assemblies Act. This is because, in order for the government—which is responsible for maintaining public order and social and political stability—to be able to take the necessary measures, it must be notified in due course and in accordance with the prescribed procedures of the date, time and venue of the assembly.

A public assembly must be distinguished from people gathering to witness something together, or from people uniting on a permanent basis for collective action.

Nor is a public assembly a private gathering convened by name or upon a personal invitation. Gathering in such a manner or in such places as to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the country is, by its very nature, prohibited.

The freedom of assembly predates freedom of the press. However, freedom of the press has gained greater significance thanks to the progress of printing and journalism.

4- It is the freedom to form associations.

5- It is the freedom of education.

An association is a body formed by a number of individuals with the aim of permanently pooling their knowledge or resources. Clubs such as the Child Protection Society, the Red Crescent Societies, the Turkish Cultural Associations and the Women's Union also fall within the category of associations.

Education is the act of one person imparting their knowledge to others. The education referred to here does not mean the teaching and learning that takes place within the family. It refers to providing general education by establishing an institution.

The freedoms of association and education differ from other individual freedoms. This is because they necessitate the continuous practice of a collective activity. For this reason, they cannot be regarded solely as individual rights.

On the one hand, associations strengthen the social fabric; on the other hand, however, as the associations that are formed will constitute organisations and forces in their own right for the state, they may also pose a threat to the state. For this reason, whilst the formation of associations is recognised as a natural right of individuals under our Constitution, it is also subject to specific provisions under a separate law. According to the Associations Act:

a) An association must, without fail, be notified to the government in accordance with the prescribed procedure following its establishment.

b) Associations may not be formed on the basis of existing laws, contrary to public morality, on an unlawful basis, or with the aim of undermining the independence of the state, altering the form of government, or dividing people against one another.

c) The formation of political associations based on ethnicity or gender is prohibited.

d) Members of an association must be at least eighteen years of age.

e) The formation of secret societies is strictly prohibited.

f) No weapons of any kind are permitted at the premises where associations meet. Only in clubs, and under the supervision of the police, may the necessary number of weapons for fencing practice and hunting be kept.

As for education, this is also a very important and delicate matter. The State takes a keen interest in the education and upbringing of its citizens. Firstly, primary education is compulsory, and education generally takes place under the supervision of the government and in accordance with its programmes, because the freedom of education varies in nature. On the one hand, it is a requirement of individual freedom, yet it relies on a collective organisation. For this reason, education must be subject to a specific legal framework. The relevant article in the Constitution states: 'All forms of education are free, subject to the supervision and control of the government and within the framework of the law.'

According to the Law on the Unification of Education, 'all academic and educational institutions within Turkey are subject to the Ministry of Education'.

However, military secondary schools, which originated from the Military Academy, have been left under the authority of the Ministry of National Defence.

The right to report and lodge complaints: ‘Turks may, individually or collectively, report matters or lodge complaints with the competent authority and the Grand National Assembly of Turkey regarding any issues they deem to be contrary to the law and regulations, whether relating to individuals or the public. The outcome of any application concerning an individual must be communicated in writing to the applicant.” (T.E.M. 82)
This right to complain, as mentioned, constitutes an individual right when it takes the form of a complaint against an injustice. However, if it takes the form of a complaint against laws or a proposal for their amendment, this constitutes a citizen’s political initiative, the form and scope of which are defined by law. ‘The right to propose legislation belongs to members of parliament and the Council of Ministers.’ Apart from this, citizens wishing to express their political views may do so by writing books or making use of the press. Governments or parliaments that are mindful of public opinion take these into consideration.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Individual rights are not the same as political rights. Some have referred to individual rights as civil rights, or as public or community rights. Whatever the name, individual rights are distinct from what we call political rights.
Political rights are those that ensure citizens’ participation in government. The clearest and most obvious example of this is the right to vote. Only those citizens to whom the law has granted these rights may exercise them.
Political rights are not granted to every member of the nation without distinction as to sex, age or ability.
(TEM 10) Individual rights, on the other hand, belong in principle to every member of the nation, regardless of their sex, form or ability.
Even some of these rights, as we have seen, are subject to certain restrictions. There are two reasons for this:
1. These rights may, in their exercise, constitute a political activity; this activity amounts to indirect participation in government. Examples include freedom of the press, freedom of association, freedom of assembly and even freedom of education, which serves to nurture future citizens.
2. The protection of those who are not yet capable of exercising their individual freedoms in practice is also a matter of concern. For example, the freedom of movement is restricted in certain circumstances.
The preservation and enforcement of freedoms

In modern constitutions, individual rights and the political rights of citizens are enshrined. However, for these rights to be exercised in practice, laws are also required to regulate how they are to be exercised and to define their limits. Without such laws, the rights guaranteed by the Constitution cannot be exercised; they remain mere promises. For this reason, regulating the exercise of these rights is an essential principle.
The Constitution and the laws governing the implementation of its provisions serve as safeguards for citizens’ natural and political rights and freedoms. However, the government is the ultimate safeguard. A political administration that recognises citizens’ freedoms, respects them, and regards their guarantee and preservation as its foremost duty is, by its very nature, a republic founded on the principle of democracy. In bygone eras, the preservation of freedoms was not an issue. For there were no freedoms.
We know that as long as the foundation of a state is based on the concept of divinity and divine will, every right in that state resides with the representative of God and the successor of the Prophet; the rights of the individual are not a matter of consideration.

Freedom of the press

It is the citizen’s freedom to disseminate their ideas freely through articles or illustrations they write for daily or periodical newspapers and pamphlets, and through the books they publish.
The theatre, cinema, gramophone, radio and telegraph are also very important and effective means for the dissemination and propagation of ideas.
Words spoken by a person in any given place remain there; their effect is immediate and limited. However, if these

words are spoken over the radio, the whole world can hear them. The telegraph is also the swiftest means of disseminating ideas. However, if a statement is recorded on a gramophone record, or particularly if it appears in a newspaper or a book, the idea is fixed; it is read throughout the world and, naturally, is passed on to future generations.
Ideas that are recorded through various means and disseminated rapidly render a great service to the progress of all humanity and to history.

Public Opinion

In a representative government based on the principle of national sovereignty, public opinion plays a major role. Without freedom of the press and freedom of assembly, and without allowing public affairs to be subject to broad scrutiny, public opinion cannot fulfil its function. The dissemination and advancement of the ideas of national sovereignty and representative government are only possible through the activity of public opinion.
The government's views must represent the views of the nation. In order for the government to understand the nation's views, it must possess the means through which these views are expressed. Although the government becomes acquainted with the people's views at election time, and the elected assemblies also represent the people's views, the views expressed by the people at election time do not remain static.
For this reason, the ability of parliaments to represent these views does not last very long. Public opinion is an ever-changing sea of ideas welling up from within the nation. In that sea, various currents and waves of debate arise.
Public opinion is a spiritual realm. The struggle of ideas taking place there cannot remain hidden from attentive eyes. In the democracies of the past, this struggle of ideas took place in assemblies where all citizens gathered together every day. Today, the sheer number of citizens and the daily obligations that civilised life imposes upon them have made it impossible for them to gather together in person on a daily basis. For this reason, public opinion has become an ideal realm, in which the critique of matters of public concern exhibits the following characteristics:
a) Criticism and debate are entirely free.
This freedom is exercised by everyone of their own accord, without influence from anyone else. It is the freedom of criticism of public opinion that keeps the government and parliament on their toes.
b) The freedom of criticism of public opinion is primarily exercised through numerous publications.
Publication prevents abuses and compels government bodies to carry out their duties properly. Publication is one of the most effective means of control. In this regard, one must not forget the truth that it is easy to criticise but difficult to act. Therefore,
c) the principle of the public good must always prevail and be upheld in all forms of criticism and debate. The ideas put forward must be in the name of the public good. When this principle serves as the starting point, criticism and debate must be conducted in the interests of the state and must serve to enhance the social and political education of citizens.
d) The freedom to criticise matters of public concern creates a basis for agreement between the government and the people. The government understands public opinion through the media and, where necessary, clarifies it with the relevant documents. The government's understanding of the people and the people's understanding of the government ensure that they form and remain a single entity.
When the government attaches importance to public opinion in order to regulate its own stance and actions, public opinion organises itself. For public opinion to be readily available and utilised at all times, it must possess an organisational structure. This organisation serves as a forum for free criticism and debate. This forum must always remain open and be constantly nourished by diverse ideas. This is achieved through the efforts of the press and the daily re-examination of the public interest. In a country where public opinion prevails, if newspapers cease to be published, the people become bewildered and frantic.
The following characteristics are evident in this intellectual organisation we have discussed:
1- The organisation of ideas is the product of a minority or a select group of individuals. Undoubtedly, the masses participate in this organisation. However, as with other matters, the role of the masses here is not an active

. Although the public reflects publications and gathers ideas, it is not the public that puts forward the ideas or forms the centres of publication.

2- In contemporary intellectual organisations, there are in fact two distinct groups at work. One of these groups consists of those who establish and manage press enterprises. The press is the necessary means for putting forward and publishing ideas. It is also the press that produces political ideas. Press enterprises take the form of newspapers, magazines and book publishing.

The role of the press in the formulation of political ideas is of a rather different nature. This is because it is always ideological groups and factions—such as political organisations—that put forward political ideas. It must be accepted as a fundamental principle that political ideas are put forward by political parties in their own interests. They do not arise spontaneously amongst the general public.

It must also be recognised that newspapers are not school textbooks.

There are instances where the press is used by certain individuals to wage battles for financial gain. There are cases where the press is utilised to spread the most blatant lies. There are other dangers to which freedom of thought is exposed through the press. There is a fear that the press, and even intellectual circles, might escape the influence of the national government and become tools for secret political or economic objectives. There is particular fear that the press might be bought with money, that the international financial elite might exert a covert influence over the press, or that the hidden subsidies of foreign states might mislead and deceive public opinion. However, these evils arising from freedom are by no means inevitable. Firstly, a legitimate boundary is drawn around press freedom. Secondly, newspapers, by establishing a specialised organisation, exert a moral influence upon themselves. In the early days, journalism—which was nothing more than a money-making venture—can evolve into a social institution. Furthermore, the intellectual and political education of the public also serves as a safeguard. The public will become accustomed to reading multiple newspapers, cross-checking them against one another, and refusing to believe journalistic fabrications. Above all, given that everything is out in the open, it is reasonable to assume that people of good faith will always form the majority. ‘For it is always possible to deceive half the world, and at times the whole world. But it is not possible to deceive the whole world all the time.’ Experience has shown that it is never possible to prevent people from saying everything. However, through the government’s appropriate course of action, in conjunction with national education and great moral forces, it is possible to create a social environment that will not allow rebellious ideas to flourish. However, it is pointless to simply allow everything to be said and to content oneself with taking precautions only after those who speak have taken action. On the day the entire population takes action, there will be no force capable of arresting them. Just as there is medical public health, so too is there social public health. Both are based on the same principle. Just as it is impossible to eradicate physical germs, so too is it impossible to eradicate spiritual germs. However, just as it is possible to foster physical health within an individual’s body, so too is it possible to foster spiritual health within the social fabric, thereby laying the groundwork for resilience.

Newspapers:

In the Republic of Turkey, the requirements that must be observed for publishing a newspaper, publishing a book or opening a printing press are set out in the Press Law and the Printing Presses Law. The procedures to be followed in cases of harmful publications and offences against individuals are also laid down in these laws and in the Criminal Code.

Our views on this matter may be summarised as follows. The press plays a vital role in public life, political life and the progress and development of the Republic. It is worth noting that the proper exercise of the press’s full and extensive freedom is a delicate matter. Above all legal restrictions, a journalist has a moral responsibility to pay attention to and respect not only knowledge, necessity and their own political views, but also the rights of citizens and the higher interests of the nation, which transcend all particular views. It is this obligation that can ensure public order. However, the effective means of eliminating the evils arising from press freedom is by no means the restrictions that once bound it, as in the past. On the contrary, the means of eliminating the drawbacks arising from press freedom lies once again in the very freedom of the press

itself...

OPEN-
MINDEDNESS

‘Freedom may well be established by force; but it is preserved by showing intolerance towards everyone and by indifference.’

We know what freedom, and freedom of conscience and religion, entail.
In the Republic of Turkey, everyone worships God as they please. No one can be subjected to any action on account of their religious beliefs. The Republic of Turkey has no official religion. In Turkey, no one attempts to force their beliefs upon others, nor is such behaviour permitted. It now appears that sincere believers and those of deep faith have learnt the requirements of freedom. Alongside all this, has bigotry been completely eradicated from the roots when it comes to religious freedom—and, more generally, freedom of conscience?
To understand this, let us examine what it means to be free from bigotry. For everyone is very prone to interpreting the meaning and mindset implied by this word in their own way. Is there anyone left who does not regard religious freedom as a right?
What do those who have come to believe that freedom of conscience consists solely of the right possessed by the human soul—under God’s supreme authority and influence—to manage its religious life, actually think today? Do such people not harbour resentment, even inwardly, towards those who do not think as they do?
Do our free allies not look upon those suspected of holding the mindset we have described with a sense of sorrow and regret?
If people of various beliefs, such as those we have mentioned, harbour animosity and hatred towards one another, look down upon one another, or even merely pity one another, then such people are not free from bigotry; they are bigots.
Open-mindedness is found in those who harbour no animosity towards the conscientious beliefs of their fellow citizens or any other person; on the contrary, they respect them. At the very least, they turn a blind eye to, or turn a deaf ear to, the beliefs of others that do not align with their own.
Such is open-mindedness. However, to speak the truth, we must say that those who love freedom for freedom’s sake—those who understand what the word ‘open-mindedness’ truly means—are very few indeed throughout the world. Bigotry is the norm everywhere. The foundation of the peaceful scene observable everywhere rests upon the mutual animosity and hatred between bigotry and free thought; the fact that this foundation does not collapse is due to the greater force that maintains the balance on this ground of animosity and hatred.
From what we have said, the following conclusion emerges: it is difficult to conclude that the barriers to freedom among us have been removed, or that we live alongside those who think and feel as we do. What is evident, therefore, is not open-mindedness, but bigotry left unchecked by weakness.
Undoubtedly, one must not complain about the diversity of ideas and beliefs. For if all ideas and beliefs were to converge at a single point, this would be a sign of stagnation, a harbinger of death. Such a state of affairs is, of course, undesirable. That is why true advocates of freedom hope that open-mindedness will become a universal virtue. Yet, even with the best of intentions, they cannot afford to let their guard down against the errors of bigotry. For with good intentions alone, they have never, ever, managed to set anything right. We know that people have been burned at the stake for the sake of the soul’s salvation.
No doubt the Inquisition priests who carried out these acts would have spoken of their good faith and of the good work they were doing; perhaps they were genuinely sincere in their words. Yet it is not difficult to make a folly or a treachery fit the mould of a good deed; ultimately, it is merely a matter of changing the name.
It is for this very reason that it is important not to take indifference to the point of apathy.
Admittedly, freedom is everyone’s right, and for this reason, true advocates of freedom insist that even those who are not advocates of freedom should be treated with generosity. However, it must never be accepted that these people would ever consent to being treated like sacrificial lambs whilst their hands and feet are bound.
It must not be forgotten that some people are determined to view the future through the lens of the past. These people

insist, without fail, on the restoration of loyalty to traditions with which we have severed ties.
Such people feel as though they are in a stranglehold if they cannot oppress those who do not share their beliefs as they see fit.
Undoubtedly, the widespread adoption of open-mindedness—to the extent that it becomes second nature—depends on a high standard of moral education.

LOYALTY

'Science has revealed to people the secret of the greatness of societies; this secret lies in the bonds between people.'

All people are members of a social body and are therefore bound to one another. Furthermore, as people are the successors of the dead, the bonds between them extend to all times and places.
These bonds are natural, social and economic. What the natural bond teaches us is this: particularly because of the division of labour and hereditary succession, everyone owes the greatest part of what they possess—and indeed of their very personal existence—to their ancestors and to the people who lived in their time.
If this is the case—that is, if there is a debt owed by every person to every other person—then, like all debts, this one must also be repaid. By whom should these debts be repaid?
By those who have amassed wealth by exploiting the natural and social bonds between people! For if it were not for the thousands of connected people, past and present, whose names are unknown, there would be no wealth at all.
To whom should it be paid?
To those who have suffered harm as a result of these natural and social bonds! Admittedly, it is impossible to identify these creditors personally; however, they do have representatives: the state or various social welfare institutions.
How should it be paid? – Firstly, as tax to the state, particularly as a progressive tax, and then to the institutions of solidarity and mutual aid, in recognition of their interdependence and mutual support.
From what we have said, it is clear that people have not, and do not, benefit equally from the blessings of the past and the present. To remedy this inequality, a form of compensation is, as it were, being sought from one group of people for the benefit of another. The main reason for this disparity in benefit is, undoubtedly, that people do not resemble one another due to their various qualities and abilities.
At this point, the following theory is put forward: the aim of progress is to make people more alike; the world is moving towards unity; differences between people in terms of class, rank, morality, dress, language and standards are gradually diminishing. History shows that the struggle for survival takes place amongst people of different religions, races, cultures, upbringings and nationalities. The march towards unity is also a march towards peace.
This final observation may be the most suitable way of forming an idea about solidarity. However, the theories of solidarity that we have considered as ideas can, in practice, be grouped under the heading of 'social guarantees'.
These social guarantees can be achieved by moving towards state socialism. This is the path of the law.
1. Labour law,
2. the Act on Health Institutions in Towns and Workshops,
3. The Act on Protection against Infectious Diseases,
4. Workers' old-age and accident insurance,
5. Compulsory assistance for the sick and elderly poor,
6. Farmers' unions,
7. Establishment of charitable societies,
8. Construction of affordable housing,
9. Grocery shops in schools for schoolchildren,
10. Legislation to provide funding from the state budget to all such organisations to ensure these and similar matters.

There are many measures of solidarity as we have listed; however, the idea of implementing these has not been universally welcomed; it has faced much criticism. In particular, there are those who view the implementation of the theory of solidarity as an action that

. They argue that shifting our weaknesses, faults and shortcomings onto society amounts to abolishing individual responsibility. Yet the foundation of moral law is individual responsibility.
These criticisms may be sufficient to force the idea of social obligation to be set aside, both practically and legally. Nor may the claim that solidarity forms the basis of morality be a sound one. However, it is also evident that, in practice, solidarity teaches us the following:

1. A kindness shown to another is a kindness to ourselves.
2. A wrong done to another is a wrong done to us as well. For this reason, we must love what is good and avoid what is evil.
3. The actions we take evoke reactions in the form of joy or sorrow amongst those around us; this situation makes us aware of our moral duties.
4. Solidarity makes us tolerant towards others. For it shows that, in the faults of others, we too are often, albeit unwittingly, complicit.

In short, solidarity replaces the notion of 'everyone for themselves' with that of 'everyone for everyone'. This notion is social, national, and, in its broadest and loftiest sense, human.

III – THE SECRETS OF M. KEMAL ATATÜRK'S SUCCESS

When asked by a journalist, 'Are you happy?', he replied: 'I am happy, because I have succeeded…' (21 June 1935).
So what, then, are the secrets of this success? In my view, the following principles can be listed:
M. Kemal Atatürk made it a principle to achieve success in every endeavour. However, he found the source of this in two fundamental principles: knowledge, science, and love for the homeland and the nation.
He believed that this spiritual strength was nourished by these elements, and he valued people who were knowledgeable and possessed sound judgement. He stated that whilst intelligence alone would lead a person to only temporary successes, success achieved through the power of reason and knowledge would be lasting. For this reason, it is essential for people of our time to achieve success through hard work and effort. Let us now set these out in order.

The concept of the homeland:

Until 1919, Mustafa Kemal fought as a military commander within the borders considered to be the homeland at that time and commanded armies.
On his way to Tripoli, during the most exhilarating period of his youth, he had rushed to liberate a part of the homeland. During the First World War, he sought to be released from his post as military attaché so that he could begin serving in the defence of the homeland as soon as possible.
For M. Kemal, whilst the homeland's territories were being defended, real-life examples of sacrificing one's life had unfolded before his very eyes.
He had heard with his own ears and seen with his own eyes the death cries of so many sons of the nation on the battlefields. He felt the pain of leaving the nation's borders with great sorrow.
When he arrived in Egypt on his return from Tripoli during the Balkan War, he received the news that Macedonia had fallen into enemy hands. He always said that this news caused him the greatest pain. He longed for the city (Thessaloniki) where he was born, grew up and where his revolutionary ideas were nurtured, right until the end of his life.
His most vivid memories—the innocent events of his childhood and the most passionate moments of his youth—had all taken place in that region. Through his feelings and memories, Atatürk was always a son of that city; the memories he most loved to recount were invariably those set in that region. Indeed, whilst recounting an exciting dream he had in the days before his death, he mentioned that he had been present alongside Salih Bozok during the unfolding of a committee-related incident in Thessaloniki. My purpose in recounting these events is as follows:

It is to indicate that M. Kemal was deeply attached to this region of the Ottoman Empire, where many Turkish families had settled, through his deep feelings and the vivid memories of his youth.
When Commander-in-Chief Marshal Gazi M. Kemal entered Izmir with his victorious army, he might have wished to pursue the fleeing enemy forces and extend his reach into Macedonia. Indeed, at that time, there had been some talk of such a move.
However, even before taking action, M. Kemal had set out on this endeavour with the resolve not to overstep the borders of what could become a strong Turkish homeland.
The joy of victory had not driven the Commander-in-Chief to act out of a desire for conquest or such impulses. He had already had the phrase 'Within the national borders, the homeland is a single entity' (23 July 1919) enshrined at the Erzurum Congress. The blood of the sons of the homeland had been shed with the aim of liberating this Turkish homeland—as defined by the National Pact—from enemy occupation.
Thus, the concept of the homeland took shape in the mind of M. Kemal Atatürk, and with the insight and strength of a man who had fought on every frontier of our present-day homeland, he established and affirmed the unity of the Turkish homeland. The first President, M. Kemal Atatürk, also ensured that other states recognised this homeland as 'an indivisible whole that accepts no separation under any circumstances or conditions'.
Atatürk never embraced the ideals of the heads of state and government of his time, who were chasing after empires for their own nations. He did not indulge in fantasies, nor did he ever try to instil such fanciful ideas in us.
In this Turkish homeland, whose borders were forged and drawn with the blood of the very last generations of Turks, he gave meaning to the concept of the homeland.
Faced with news of a death, he had me write the following words for the sake of the homeland:
"Homeland! May everything be sacrificed for you. You are the blessed one. We are all martyrs for you. But you, Turkish soil, will remain fertile to keep the Turkish nation alive for eternity! You are not the grave of the Turkish nation that loves you; show your creativity for the Turkish nation." (1930)
With these words, Atatürk bestowed a sacred identity upon the homeland, emphasising its concepts of creativity and vitality.
Indeed, these homeland lands, as defined by Atatürk, are sacred. The whole world knows that whilst friendly hands are shaken upon them, we are determined not to allow the feet of the enemy to tread upon them.

Love of the nation:

Atatürk, living on the soil of the homeland, chose the path of achieving success through his love for his nation. He explains this love with the following words:
"There is no love greater than love for one's nation. I believe I, too, rendered certain services to my nation during the War of Independence. However, I did not take credit for any of them. I said that everything that was done was the work of the nation. If one were to look for the truth, this is indeed the case. We cannot claim to have done everything necessary to prove that we are the children of a race and a nation that has founded countless civilisations in the past. There are still many great tasks left for us to undertake today and in the future. Scientific research is among these. My advice to my colleagues is this: let us work together, not for our own sake, but for the sake of the nation to which we belong. This is the greatest of all endeavours."
Atatürk's words contain a complete programme for us all. Every individual who draws inspiration from the wellspring of love for the nation finds within themselves the strength to perform many services for that great entity. Work carried out in unison, placing the common good above personal interests, yields beneficial results for the nation as a whole. If we embrace the power contained in Atatürk's words and make them our guide, we shall become the architects of endeavours that will be held in high esteem by our nation.
Atatürk found peace of mind when he saw his ideas and principles put into practice.
He was able to achieve great things because he drew his inspiration from his love for the nation. He found his identity in the greatness of this nation. He put it exactly as follows:
'Our path is charted by the homeland in which we live, the Turkish nation from whose bosom we sprang, and the conclusions we have drawn from the pages of a history of nations that records a thousand and one tragedies and sufferings.'

What is not implied in this brief statement by Atatürk? The Turks and

their civilisation in history:

Atatürk, who, as Commander-in-Chief, liberated the homeland in which we live, never lost sight of the Turkish nation from which he sprang, in its three forms:
The Turkish presence in the past, the living Turkish nation, and the Turks of the future.
I was a close witness to and collaborator during the times when he researched the Turkish presence in the past. For to know Turkish civilisation in history is to build a structure upon a foundation for the living Turkish nation. It was precisely this foundation that Atatürk sought to penetrate to its very depths. For a history spanning six hundred years, which presented a conundrum to him, could not be considered a sufficient foundation for the Turkish presence. It is essential that new horizons in history, extending as far back as ancient times, be opened up for our people as well. It seems impossible that the Turkish peoples, who have made their presence felt in various geographical regions throughout history, should not have roots stretching back to even earlier periods. There have, of course, been periods when the Turkish people, now organised under the concept of a nation, lived as a tribe. It was precisely this that Atatürk sought: he wanted historians to examine, on the basis of documentary evidence, the traces of the Turkish people's expansion from their homeland through migrations during these periods, just as they had done in historical times. It is well known to those who study such documents that this is addressed and explained even in the most recent works. Some of our citizens, having not had the opportunity to examine these closely, have come to misunderstand this reality. For example, taking these migrations from the homeland into account, they have said, 'You are making the world Turkish.' I know for a fact that this view does not represent Atatürk's fundamental idea.
I would like to explain this as follows: Just as we can identify the Turkish presence throughout history—sometimes as founders of states, sometimes as tribal incursions into other states—so too was the situation in earlier periods.
Since the world did not become 'Turkish' as a result of the raids of the historical era, it is possible to find traces of the Turkish presence in the periods preceding it as well. This was the answer to the questions that occupied Atatürk's mind. It is a matter of scientific research to fill in the gaps in the historical rings of the Turks stretching back from the present day and to uncover this existence as deeply as possible at its foundations.
'Our forefathers, who founded great states, also possessed great and comprehensive civilisations. It is our duty to seek this out, to study it, and to make it known to the Turkish people and the world,' said Atatürk. He sought to free history from being static and always wished for new generations to study the history of their homeland and nation with a dynamic approach.
He said: 'The more the Turkish child comes to know his forebears, the more he will find the strength within himself to achieve greater things.
Everyone can experience this for themselves. Let us focus our thoughts on the national enthusiasm we feel when faced with a civilised work belonging to our forebears. I would like to emphasise the following here. Alongside the admiration I feel for the world's most beautiful civilised works, I have felt an entirely different kind of enthusiasm for works belonging to my own nation. I view the former with the appreciation one has for a beautiful person. The latter, however, I view with a sense of national pride and fervour, embracing them and recognising in them the shared characteristics of my nation. It is in this way that, by seeking, understanding and keeping alive our national identity—both in our recent past and in more ancient times—we come to understand the present.
I would also like to take this opportunity to point out that we must learn a lesson from the mistakes we perceive in history.
For example, Atatürk learnt valuable lessons from understanding the causes of the collapse of the last Ottoman Empire. Yet, he also harboured admiration and affection for the Ottoman Empire's era of ascendancy. For him, Fatih was not merely a great Turkish figure, but one of the greatest men in world history. He paid particular attention to the character traits he identified in Osman and Orhan, the founders of the state. However, he envisaged the promotion of those who had contributed to the Turkish identity through their material and spiritual works, and the bringing to light of their historical significance. For it is the works of civilisation that secure a people's rightful place in history.
At the same time, he did not espouse racism. Atatürk always shied away from promoting the theory of a 'superior race'

. Whilst he wished for the racial characteristics of the Turkish nation to be determined using modern scientific methods, his sole aim was to reveal the true state of affairs. The idea of ‘racism’, which was driven by political currents in other countries during his time, never found a place among us. He valued every nation and considered them worthy of respect.
However, he also aimed to ensure that the nation to which he belonged was recognised for its true worth. As head of state, Atatürk explained national policy as follows:
‘Within our national borders, first and foremost to preserve our existence by relying on our own strengths; to work for the true happiness and prosperity of the nation and the country; not to enslave or deceive the nation in pursuit of vague and far-reaching ambitions; and to expect civilised and humane treatment and reciprocal friendship in the civilised world.’

National and humanitarian sentiment:

M. Kemal embarked on the War of Independence with the greatest strength of national sentiment. Whenever he recalled this later on, he felt the undiminished excitement of his initial sentiments. For Atatürk, the existence of the nation was always paramount. For one must believe that, by relying on the strength and power bestowed upon humanity by the Almighty God—who creates all material and spiritual existence—and on the sublimity of national sentiment, all endeavours can be accomplished. Atatürk offered the following guidance on this matter: ‘National morality is that which demands from people, in every respect, concern, endeavour, self-sacrifice, and—when required—the willing sacrifice of one’s self for the sake of the nation’s social order and tranquillity, its present and future prosperity, happiness, safety and innocence, and for the progress and advancement of civilisation. In a perfect nation, the requirements of national morality are fulfilled by its members with a conscientious and emotional zeal, almost without conscious deliberation. This is the greatest national fervour.”
Atatürk, who acted in accordance with these ideas and driven by these lofty national sentiments, was a man of great success.
In 1923, whilst addressing young people in Afyonkarahisar, he said exactly the following:
‘If an excessive degree of initiative has been observed in me, this does not stem from me, but is an initiative arising from the collective will of the nation. Had it not been for you, had your moral inclinations not served as a point of support for me, none of the initiatives within me would have come to pass.’
When one examines all the words Atatürk spoke on every occasion, it becomes clear that he always regarded national sentiments as fundamental.
Atatürk, who constantly reiterated the idea that ‘the source of inspiration and strength is the nation itself’, placed great importance on the presence of citizens with strong national sentiments. However, at the same time, he never failed to emphasise the need to attach great value to civilised and humanitarian sentiments.
Alongside national sentiment, humanitarian sentiment holds a very high place of honour. For Atatürk, the Turkish nation is a great national power when it marches in step with other nations of the world in the realm of civilisation.
Nations make their mark on history and preserve their living identity through the works created by the individual efforts of their people and the successes achieved by their great figures, whatever the field. In accordance with these principles, we must always draw upon the intellectual legacy of the great, renowned figures of history.
It is for this reason that, following the success of our War of Independence against imperialism, the nations of the East have regarded Atatürk as the symbol and pioneer of a free and independent existence.

Courage:

M. Kemal is courageous. This is because, in order to succeed in his undertakings, he ensures that all preparations are in place and, having calculated what his opponents might do, he has decided in advance to act with caution against them.
For example, when he decided on the Great Offensive and was finalising his plans, he would say that he had calculated what counter-moves the enemy forces might make and had already considered taking precautions even in the worst-case scenarios.

Responsibility:

He always took responsibility upon himself. This was because he believed in the success of those who were conscious of their responsibilities in any undertaking. The idea Atatürk emphasised regarding responsibility is as follows:

‘The courage and enthusiasm to take responsibility are the most essential qualities in any endeavour. Many people become the most courageous and daring when they know that the responsibility lies with others; however, if the responsibility falls on them, it is seen that this courage and daring diminish and they become timid. Whereas those who consciously and deliberately take responsibility, whether in small or large matters, achieve success in the tasks they undertake.”

According to these ideas, particularly within a democratic system, being aware of one’s responsibility is an essential quality. In our family, social and professional lives, every individual can be positive and successful through this sense of responsibility, and it is only in this way that we can secure our place as a nation in the civilised world. When Atatürk took on responsibility under the most difficult circumstances, he always strove to serve the general interests of the nation and thus achieved great success.

Since the end of the Second World War, it has become customary to broadly divide countries into two categories, and the following terms are used: ‘less developed’ or ‘economically developing’ countries. Whilst Turkey is regarded as a European country within the United Nations (UNESCO), it is also classified amongst the less developed countries.

People often ask me how Atatürk would have acted on certain current issues had he been alive today. My answer to this is as follows:

You are free to interpret this as you wish, but if we consider Atatürk’s actions and ideas, even during the most critical period of our history, he never lost confidence in either himself or his nation. He always maintained a high level of moral strength. That is why I say that, were he alive today, he would neither use the term ‘underdevelopment’ himself nor allow us, as a nation, to use it. In this respect, the use and adoption of such a term for our nation implies a lack of self-confidence on the part of individuals, and so it must be rejected. Yes, there are areas where we lag behind in industry, science and technology, but by utilising our country’s rich natural resources and valuing the science and technology the world has achieved today, it is certainly possible for us to take our place within modern civilisation.

M. Kemal Atatürk summarised his greatest advice to the Turkish nation in these three words: Turk! Be proud, work hard, have confidence!

I was present when he had these words inscribed on the Security Monument in Ankara and listened to his explanation. He said:

Turkishness is fundamental. It is appropriate to explore this identity throughout history and take pride in the Turkish civilisation that will be identified. However, to be worthy of this pride, we must work hard today. We must aim to be diligent in order to produce works in every field, particularly in the realm of civilisation.

On 26 March 1937, whilst addressing the youth, he said: ‘You say you will follow me tirelessly. But, my friends, what does “tirelessly” mean? Is it possible not to tire? Of course, you will tire. What I ask of you is not to avoid tiring, but to keep moving forward without stopping even when you are tired, and to follow me without resting even in the very moment you feel tired. Tiredness is a natural state for every human being. However, there is a spiritual strength within a person that can overcome tiredness; it is this strength that drives the weary forward without allowing them to rest.

You, the young sons and daughters of the new Turkey! Even if you grow tired, you shall follow me… Those who resolve to walk without resting will never, ever grow tired. Turkish youth will march ceaselessly and tirelessly towards the goal, towards our lofty ideal.”

Atatürk believed that a nation composed of hard-working individuals could have confidence in the future. Nations that can take pride in their history and rely on their own efforts are, of course, justified in looking to the future with confidence.

CONCLUSION

As I bring this book to a close, I wish to explain what I understand by the terms ‘Kemalism’ and ‘Atatürkism’, whilst touching upon the issues currently under discussion.

In this book, whilst presenting M. Kemal Atatürk’s biography and aspects of his intellectual life supported by documents, I have not addressed the Turkish Revolution itself in any particular sequence. Yet, in the present day, these terms must be clarified in every respect. M. Kemal Atatürk fulfilled his historic mission, which came to an end with his death, in the year the Republic of Turkey turned 15, on the eve of the Second World War. The defining characteristic of this historic period, which has now spanned half a century, must be examined in two parts.

The first covers the years 1918–1922: the defence against the enemy that had invaded our homeland and the establishment of an independent Turkish state within defined borders.

The second period spans 1922–1938. M. Kemal refers to this time as the ‘Turkish Revolution’ and defines the revolution as follows:

‘To forcibly change the existing institutions.’ To clarify this further, he adds: ‘It is to demolish the institutions that have held back the Turkish nation over the past centuries and to establish in their place new institutions that will ensure the nation’s progress in accordance with the highest civilised requirements.’

According to this definition, the first phase of the Turkish Revolution encompasses the changes made to the form of the state and its institutions. It was necessary to transform the institutions of the monarchical, theocratic Ottoman state into those of the democratic, secular Republic of Turkey in accordance with this new form. Whilst considering this as a whole, alongside the forcible transformation of state institutions, developments in line with the conditions of the time were naturally recorded within the social fabric, which was in a state of constant progress.

In the early years of the Republic, the granting of equal political rights to women—who constituted half the nation’s population—and the reform of family law, which held great significance in our social life, were undoubtedly revolutionary steps. If we compare this with the situation in other countries around the world, we can see it as a major step forward.

Whilst we regard the wearing of modern clothing and hats as a civilised necessity of our age, clothing naturally adapts to innovations and changes in every era. However, during the period of the Ottoman Empire’s decline, it was giving the Turks an uncivilised appearance in terms of dress. The development of the rigid traditional order of that time has, of course, brought benefits. For these traditions were representatives of a backward mindset. In the intellectual sphere, the most fruitful and decisive change was the reform of the alphabet. This was, of course, a major revolution. As the leader of this movement, Atatürk sought not a gradual development and implementation, but to ensure a sudden transition from the old to the new—and with ease—through legislation. This revolution has undoubtedly increased literacy rates across all sectors of society.

M. Kemal Atatürk established the following principles and explained them himself. ‘We are republicans,’ he said, envisaging a system of government based on national sovereignty that would function in accordance with the development of democratic procedures.

Nationalism, taking Turkish nationalism as its basis and rejecting Ottomanism, does not consider the ideologies of the ummah and Turanism to be suitable for our national policy.

The essence of nationalism is symbolised by the name ‘Turk’.

Populism, on the other hand, is a wholly democratic principle. This is because it entails the equality of all before the law and the non-recognition of class superiority. Consequently, class struggle is not accepted as a principle either. In Turkey, the Turkish people are defined by their division of labour.

Statism is, in this context, an expression of a purely economic understanding. The following explanations have been provided on this matter:

‘Whilst the individual’s work is fundamental, it is one of our key principles to actively involve the state—particularly in the economic sphere—in matters dictated by the general and higher interests of the nation, in order to bring the nation to prosperity and develop the country in the shortest possible time.’ Numerous discussions and explanations regarding this definition took place between Atatürk and the statesmen of the time. In accordance with this principle, importance has been attached, in accordance with a plan, not only to the economic institutions that have been nationalised but also to those in the industrial sector that are directly owned by the state.

Secularism means the separation of religion from worldly affairs and of religion from state affairs. Believing in the necessity of ensuring that all laws and procedures in state administration are based on modern science and technology and are

, it was deemed unacceptable to conflate them with religious beliefs. Finally, ‘Revolutionism’ was added to these principles. A definition of this term has also been provided, stating: ‘Remaining faithful to the principles born of and developed through the revolutions our nation has achieved through great sacrifices remaining and defend them is fundamental.” However the this expression is what I have heard from Atatürk’s speeches is as follows:

These principles we have laid down are those we have deemed beneficial for the development of our nation along the path of civilisation, in accordance with the requirements of the present day. However, the social structure is in a state of constant development and must inevitably strive towards perfection. Science and technology, meanwhile, are always open to innovations and inventions. Faced with this situation, people’s desires and needs continue to grow and develop in ever-increasing ways, both in the material and spiritual spheres.

No principle can retain its dogmatic nature throughout the course of history. For this reason, the Turkish nation is obliged to fulfil the requirements of the level of civilisation of the age in which it lives.

It is precisely by adhering to this principle of revolution that the Turkish community will find the path to avoid falling behind in the world of civilisation. However, the point that must always be borne in mind in this regard is the preservation of our national unity and national interests with the utmost care.

Thus, the principle of ‘Revolutionary Spirit’ gave rise to a number of fundamental changes during the early years of our Republic, whilst also serving as a guiding principle for the future of the Turkish nation.

I would also like to note on this occasion that not every theory regarded as an ideal can be applied to all nations. Only leaders and administrators who thoroughly understand the nature of their own nation and emerge from within it possess the ability to advance society, provided they make use of the findings of modern science.

A revolution holds value not merely by overthrowing the old order, but when it is constructive and founding in nature. I conclude this concluding section of my book with the following words of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: ‘Man is the expression of movement and activity—that is, of dynamism.’

IV- NOTES IN M. KEMAL ATATÜRK’S HANDWRITING

C’s Cultural Service:

Atatürk
c Citizenship Information Written by Atatürk – Bülent Tanör
c The War of Independence (Turkey 1918–1923)
c The Founding (Turkey, from 1920 onwards) Prof. Dr Sina Akşin
c An Outline of Turkey’s Recent History I c An Outline of Turkey’s Recent History II Prof. Dr Macit Gökberk
c The Philosophy of the Enlightenment, Revolutions and Atatürk by Yunus Nadi
c We Did Not Find Turkey on the Street Falih Rıfkı Atay
c The Revolutionary Who Gave His Life (Ali Suavi) Bâki Öz
c The Alevi-Bektashi Community in the War of Independence Prof. Dr Tarık Zafer Tunaya
c Kemalism within the Revolutionary Movements Sabahattin Selek
c The National Struggle (From the Great Offensive to Izmir) by İsmail Arar

c Atatürk’s Press Conference in İzmit
Prof. Dr Niyazi Berkes
c Why Have We Been Struggling for
200 Years? I c Why Have We Been
Struggling for 200 Years? II
Ceyhun Atuf Kansu c
The Revolutionary’s
Calendar
Paul Dumont-François Georgeon
c The Death of an Empire (1908–1923)
Ali Fuat Cebesoy
c My Classmate Atatürk I c My
Classmate Atatürk II
Abdi İpekçi
c İnönü Recounts Atatürk Paul
Dumont
c History as Written by Atatürk: The
Speech by Kılıç Ali
c Memoirs of the Independence
Court by Prof. Dr Niyazi
Berkes
c Westernisation, Nationalism and Social Revolutions
I c Westernisation, Nationalism and Social
Revolutions II
S. İ. Aralov
c Memoirs of a Soviet Diplomat in Turkey I c
Memoirs of a Soviet Diplomat in Turkey II
Sabahattin Selek
c Memoirs of İsmet İnönü Nurer
Uğurlu
c A Geometry Guide Written by Atatürk
George Duhamel
c New Turkey: A Western State
Bülent Tanör
c Local Congress Governments in Turkey
by Prof. Dr Suna Kili
c The Atatürk Revolution – A Model of
Modernisation by Falih Rıfkı Atay
c What Atatürk Told Me by Reşit
Ülker
c Atatürk’s Speech in Bursa by
Prof. Dr Tarık Zafer Tunaya
c The Islamist Movement
I c The Islamist
Movement II c The
Islamist Movement III
M. Şakir Ülkütaşır
c Atatürk and the Alphabet
Reform Kılıç Ali
c The Characteristics of
Atatürk by Mustafa Kemal
c Memoirs of Anafartalar by
Ecvet Güresin
c The 31 March
Uprising by Doğan
Avcıoğlu

c Foreign Involvement in the 31 March Uprising by Metin Toker
c Sheikh Sait and His Uprising by Süleyman Edip Balkır
c Memoirs of an Old Teacher by Yunus Nadi
c The First Grand National Assembly by Kemal Sülker
c The Emergence of the Working Class in the World and in Turkey by Prof. Dr Neda Armaner
c Movements Deviating from Islam: Nurculuk by Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca
c Atatürk in Epics: The Epic of 19 May by Yunus Nadi
c Mustafa Kemal Pasha in Samsun, by İsmet Zeki Eyuboğlu
c The Footsteps of Reaction Nuri Conker
c Mustafa Kemal: Officer and Commander
c A Conversation on 'The Officer and the Commander' by İsmet Zeki Eyuboğlu
c Sects that Have Broken Away from Islam: The Naqshbandi Order by Ord. Prof. Dr Yusuf Hikmet Bayur
c The Armenian Question – I c The Armenian Question – II Talât Pasha
c Memoirs Prof. Dr Tarık Zafer Tunaya c The Proclamation of Freedom İsmet İnönü
c The Treaty of Lausanne I c The Treaty of Lausanne II Sami N. Özerdim
c The Story of the Script Reform Nurer Uğurlu
c Atatürk's Books on Military Affairs
c Atatürk's Translated Books on Military Affairs Halide Edip Adıvar
c The Turk's Trial by Fire I c The Turk's Trial by Fire II c The Turk's Trial by Fire III Prof. Dr Muammer Aksoy c Atatürk and Full Independence Prof. Dr Şerafettin Turan
c Atatürk and the National Language by Johannes Glasneck
c Kemal Atatürk and Modern Turkey I c Kemal Atatürk and Modern Turkey II c Kemal Atatürk and Modern Turkey III

İsmet İnönü
c The Early Years of the Republic
– I Gazi Mustafa Kemal
c ‘Tomorrow We Shall Proclaim the Republic’
(from the Nutuk) c ‘Tomorrow We Shall Proclaim
the Republic’ (from the Söylev)
Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca
c Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in
Action / On 10 November
Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın
c Longing for Atatürk I
Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın
c Longing for Atatürk II
by Cavit Orhan Tütengil
c Understanding and Completing Atatürk

BERSERKER
BOOKS